

of adequate relief for the needy unemployed who are capable of performing useful work, I shall discuss with the Congress during the coming months. The broader task of preventing unemployment is a matter of long-range evolutionary policy, and to (that) it we must continue to give our best thought and effort. We cannot assume that immediate industrial and commercial activity which mitigates present pressures justifies the national government at this time in placing the unemployment problem in a filing cabinet of finished business. (Applause)

Fluctuations in employment are tied to all other wasteful fluctuations in our mechanism of production and distribution. One of these wastes is speculation. In securities or commodities, the larger the volume of speculation, the wider become the upward and downward swings and the more certain the result that in the long run there will be more losses than gains in the underlying wealth of the community.

And, as is now well known to all of us, the same net loss to society comes from reckless overproduction and monopolistic underproduction of our natural and manufactured commodities. (Applause)

Yes, overproduction and underproduction and speculation are three evil sisters who distill the troubles of unsound inflation and the troubles of disastrous deflation.

It is to the interest of the nation, as a whole, to have government help private enterprise to gain sound general price levels and to protect those levels from wide and perilous fluctuations. We know now that if early in 1931 government had taken the steps (which) that were taken two (and) or three years later, the depression would never have reached the depths of the beginning of 1933. (Prolonged applause)

Sober second thought confirms most of us, I think, in the belief that the broad objectives of the National Recovery Act were sound. (Applause) We know now that its difficulties arose from the fact that it tried to do too much. For example, it was unwise, perhaps, to expect the same agency to regulate the length of working hours, minimum wages, child labor and collective bargaining on the one hand and the complicated questions of unfair trade practices and business controls on the other.

The statute of NRA has been outlawed. The problems have not. They are still with us. (Prolonged applause)

That decent conditions and adequate pay for labor, and just return for agriculture, can be secured through parallel and simultaneous action by forty-eight states is a proven impossibility. (Applause) It is equally impossible to obtain curbs on monopoly, unfair trade practices and speculation by state action alone. There are those who,

sincerely or insincerely, still cling to state action as a theoretical hope. But experience with actualities makes it clear that Federal laws supplementing state laws are needed to help solve the problems which result from modern invention applied in an industrialized nation which conducts its business with scant regard to state lines.

During the past year there has been a growing belief in the Nation that there is little fault to be found with the Constitution of the United States as it stands today. (Applause) The vital need is not an alteration of our fundamental law, but an increasingly enlightened view with reference to it. (Applause, cheers) Difficulties have grown out of its interpretation; but rightly considered, it can be used as an instrument of progress, and not as a device for prevention of action. (Applause)

It is worth our while to read and re-read the preamble of the Constitution of the United States, (applause) and Article I thereof which confers the legislative powers upon the Congress of the United States. (Applause) It is also worth our while to read again the debates in the Constitutional Convention of one hundred and fifty years ago. From such reading, I obtain and I believe most of you obtain the very definite thought that the members of that Convention were fully aware that civilization would raise problems for the proposed new Federal Government, which they



themselves could not even surmise; and that it was their definite intent and expectation that a liberal interpretation in the years to come would give to the Congress the same relative powers over new national problems as they themselves gave to the Congress over the national problems of their day. (Prolonged applause)

In presenting to the Convention the first basic draft of the Constitution, Edmund Randolph explained that it was the purpose "to insert essential principles only, lest the operation of government should be clogged by rendering those provisions permanent and unalterable which ought to be accommodated to times and events."

With a better understanding of our purposes, and a more intelligent recognition of our needs as a nation, it is not to be assumed that there will be prolonged failure to bring legislative and judicial action into closer harmony. Means must be found to adapt our legal forms and our judicial interpretation to the actual present national needs of the largest progressive democracy in the modern world. (Applause)

That thought leads to a consideration of world problems. To go no further back than the beginning of this century, men and women everywhere were seeking conditions of life very different from those which were customary before modern invention and modern industry and modern communications had come into being. The World War, for all of its



tragedy, encouraged these demands, and stimulated action to fulfill these new desires.

Many national governments seemed unable adequately to respond; and, often with the improvident assent of the masses of the people themselves, new forms of government were set up with oligarchy taking the place of democracy. In oligarchies, militarism has leapt forward, while in those nations which have retained democracy, militarism has waned. (Applause)

I have recently visited three of our sister Republics in South America. The very cordial receptions with which I was greeted were in tribute to democracy. (Applause) To me the outstanding observation of that visit was that the masses of the peoples of all the Americas are convinced that the democratic form of government can be made to succeed and do not wish to substitute for it any other form of government. (Prolonged applause) They believe that democracies are best able to cope with the changing problems of modern civilization within themselves, and that democracies are best able to maintain peace among themselves.

The Inter-American Conference, operating on these fundamental principles of democracy, did much to assure peace in this Hemisphere. Existing peace machinery was improved. New instruments to maintain peace and eliminate causes of war were adopted. Wider protection of the interests

of the American Republics in the event of war outside the Western Hemisphere was provided. Respect for, and observance of, international treaties and international law were strengthened. Principles of liberal trade policies, as effective aids to the maintenance of peace were reaffirmed. The intellectual and cultural relationships among American Republics were broadened as a part of the general peace program.

In a world unhappily thinking in terms of war, the representatives of twenty-one nations sat around a table, in an atmosphere of complete confidence and understanding, sincerely discussing measures for maintaining peace. Here was a great and (a) permanent achievement directly affecting the lives and security of the two hundred and fifty million human beings who dwell in this Western Hemisphere. Here was an example which must have a wholesome effect upon the rest of the world. (Applause)

Yes, in a very real sense, the Conference in Buenos Aires sent forth a message on behalf of all the democracies of the world to those nations which live otherwise. Because such other governments are perhaps more spectacular, it was high time for democracy to assert itself. (Applause)

Because all of us believe that our democratic form of government can cope adequately with modern problems

as they arise, it is patriotic as well as logical for us to prove that we can meet new national needs with new laws consistent with an historic constitutional framework clearly intended to receive liberal and not narrow interpretation. (Applause)

The United States of America, within itself, must continue the task of making democracy succeed.

In that task the legislative branch of (our) the government will, I am confident, continue to meet the demands of democracy whether they relate to the curbing of abuses, the extension of help to those who need help, or the better balancing of our interdependent economies.

So, too, the Executive branch of the government must move forward in this task, and, at the same time, provide better management for administrative action of all kinds.

The Judicial branch also is asked by the people to do its part in making democracy successful. We do not ask the Courts to call non-existent powers into being, but we have a right to expect that conceded powers or those legitimately implied shall be made effective instruments for the common good. (Applause)

The process of our democracy must not be imperiled by the denial of essential powers of free government.

Your task and mine is not ending with the end of the depression. The people of the United States have



made it clear that they expect us to continue our active efforts in behalf of their peaceful advancement. (Applause)

In that spirit of endeavor and service I greet the Seventy-Fifth Congress at the beginning of this auspicious New Year. (Prolonged applause)

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
FROM THE STEPS OF THE CAPITOL

January 20, 1937

MY FELLOW-COUNTRYMEN:

When four years ago we met to inaugurate a President, the Republic, single-minded in anxiety, stood in spirit here. We dedicated ourselves to the fulfillment of a vision -- to speed the time when there would be for all the people that security and peace essential to the pursuit of happiness. We of the Republic pledged ourselves to drive from the temple of our ancient faith those who had profaned it; to end by action, tireless and unafraid, the stagnation and despair of that day.

We did those first things first.

Our covenant with ourselves did not stop there. Instinctively we recognized a deeper need -- the need to find through government the instrument of our united purpose to solve for the individual the ever-rising problems of a complex civilization. Repeated attempts at their solution without the aid of government had left us baffled and bewildered. For, without that aid, we had been unable to create those moral controls over the services of science which are necessary to make science a useful servant instead of a ruthless

master of mankind. To do this we knew that we must find practical controls over blind economic forces and blindly selfish men.

We of the Republic sensed the truth that democratic government has innate capacity to protect its people against disasters once considered inevitable -- to solve problems once considered unsolvable. We would not admit that we could not find a way to master economic epidemics just as, after centuries of fatalistic suffering, we had found a way to master epidemics of disease. We refused to believe, we refused to leave the problems of our common welfare to be solved by the winds of chance and the hurricanes of disaster.

In this we Americans were discovering no wholly new truth; we were writing a new chapter in our book of self-government.

This year marks the (one) hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Constitutional Convention which made us a nation. At that Convention our forefathers found the way out of the chaos which followed the Revolutionary War; they created a strong government with powers of united action sufficient then and now to solve problems utterly beyond individual or local (solution) action. A century and a half ago they established the Federal Government in order to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings



of liberty to the American people.

Today we invoke those same powers of government to achieve the same objectives.

Four years of new experience have not belied our historic instinct. They hold out the clear hope that government within communities, government within the separate states, and government of the United States can do the things the times require, without yielding its democracy. Our tasks in the last four years did not force democracy to take a holiday.

Nearly all of us recognize that as intricacies of human relationships increase, so power to govern them also must increase -- power to stop evil; power to do good. The essential democracy of our nation and the safety of our people depend not upon the absence of power but upon lodging it with those whom the people can change or continue at stated intervals through an honest and free system of elections. The Constitution of 1787 did not make our democracy impotent.

In fact, in these last four years, we have made the exercise of all power more democratic; for we have begun to bring private autocratic powers into their proper subordination to the (public's) people's government. The legend that they were invincible -- above and beyond the processes of a democracy -- has been shattered. They have been challenged,

(and) they have been beaten.

Our progress out of the depression is obvious.

But that is not all that you and I mean by the new order of things. Our pledge was not merely to do a patch-work job with second-hand materials. By using the new materials of social justice we have undertaken to erect on the old foundations a more enduring structure for the better use of future generations. (Applause)

In that purpose we have been helped by achievements of mind and spirit. Old truths have been relearned; untruths have been unlearned. We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics. Out of the collapse of a prosperity whose builders boasted their practicality has come the conviction that in the long run economic morality pays. We are beginning to wipe out the line that divides the practical from the ideal; and in so doing we are fashioning an instrument of unimagined power for the establishment of a morally better world.

This new understanding undermines the old admiration of worldly success as such. We are beginning to abandon our tolerance of the abuse of power by those who betray for profit the elementary decencies of life.

In this process evil things formerly accepted will not be so easily condoned. Hard-headedness will not so

easily excuse hard-heartedness. We are moving toward an era of good feeling. But we realize that there can be no era of good feeling save among men of good-will.

For these reasons I am justified in believing that the greatest change that we have witnessed has been the change in the moral climate of America.

Among men of good-will science and democracy together offer an ever-richer life and ever-larger satisfaction to the individual. With this change in our moral climate and our re-discovered ability to improve our economic order, we have set our feet upon the road of enduring progress.

Shall we pause (now) and turn our back upon the road that lies ahead? Shall we call this the promised land? Or, shall we continue on our way? For "each age is a dream that is dying, or one that is coming to birth."

Many voices are heard as we face a great decision. Comfort says "tarry a while." Opportunism says "this is a good spot." Timidity asks "how difficult is the road ahead?"

True, we have come far from the days of stagnation and despair. Vitality has been preserved. Courage and confidence have been restored. Mental and moral horizons have been extended.

But our present gains were won under the pressure of more than ordinary circumstance. Advance became imperative under the goad of fear and suffering. The very times were



on the side of progress.

To hold to progress today (however) is more difficult. Dulled conscience, irresponsibility, (and) ruthless self-interest already reappear. Such symptoms of prosperity may become the portents of disaster! Prosperity already tests the persistence of our progressive purpose.

So, let us ask again: Have we reached the goal of our vision of that fourth day of March, 1933? Have we found our happy valley?

I see a great nation, upon a great continent, blessed with a great wealth of natural resources. Its hundred and thirty million people are at peace among themselves; they are making their country a good neighbor among the nations. I see a United States which can demonstrate that, under democratic methods of government, national wealth can be translated into a spreading volume of human comforts hitherto unknown -- and the lowest standard of living can be raised far above the level of mere subsistence.

But here is the challenge to our democracy: In this nation I see tens of millions of its citizens -- a substantial part of its whole population -- who at this very moment are denied the greater part of what the very lowest standards of today call the necessities of life.

I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day.

I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labelled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago.

I see millions denied education, recreation and the opportunity to better (their) the lot of themselves and (the lot of) their children.

I see millions lacking the means to buy the products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions.

I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished.

But it is not in despair that I paint (you) that picture for you. I paint it for you in hope -- because the nation, seeing and understanding the injustice (in) of it, proposes to paint it out. (Applause) We are determined to make every American citizen the subject of his country's interest and concern; and we will never regard any faithful law-abiding group within our borders as superfluous. The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little. (Applause)

If I know aught of the spirit and purpose of our nation, we will not listen to Comfort, Opportunism and Timidity. We will carry on. (Applause)

Overwhelmingly, we of the Republic are men and women of good-will -- men and women who have more than warm hearts of dedication -- men and women who have cool heads and willing hands of practical purpose as well. They will insist that every agency of popular government use effective instruments to carry out their will.

Government is competent when all who compose it work as trustees for the whole people. It can make constant progress when it keeps abreast of all the facts. It can obtain justified support and legitimate criticism when the people receive true information of all that government does.

If I know aught of the will of our people, they will demand that these conditions of effective government shall be created and maintained. They will demand a nation uncorrupted by cancers of injustice and, therefore, strong among the nations in its example of the will to peace.

Today we consecrate our country to long cherished ideals in a suddenly changed civilization. In every land there are always at work forces that drive men apart and forces that draw men together. In our personal ambitions we are individualists. But in our seeking for economic and political progress as a nation, we all go up -- or else

we all go down -- as one people. (Applause)

To maintain a democracy of effort requires a vast amount of patience in dealing with differing methods and a vast amount of humility. But out of the confusion of many voices rises an understanding of dominant public need. Then political leadership can voice common, humane ideals, and aid in their realization. (Applause)

In taking again the oath of office as President of the United States, I assume the solemn obligation of leading the American people forward along the road over which they have chosen to advance. (Applause)

While this duty rests upon me I shall do my utmost to speak their purpose and to do their will, seeking Divine Guidance to help us each and every one to give light to them that sit in darkness and to guide our feet into the way of peace. (Prolonged applause)

- - - - -



no longer. We are celebrating the 1936 victory. That was not a final victory. It was a victory whereby our party won further opportunity to lead in the solution of the pressing problems that perplex our generation. Whether we shall celebrate in 1938, and in 1940, and in 1944, as we celebrate tonight, will deservedly depend upon whether the party continues on its course and solves these problems. (Applause)

And if I have aught to say about it, it will continue on its course and it will solve these problems. (Applause)

After election day in 1936, some of our supporters were uneasy, uneasy lest we grasp the excuse of a false era of good feeling to evade our obligations. They were worried by the evil symptom that the propaganda and the epithets of last summer and fall had died down.

Today, however, those who placed their confidence in us are reassured. (Applause) For the tumult and the shouting have broken forth anew -- and from substantially the same elements of opposition. This new roar -- for that is the best term -- is the best evidence in the world that we have begun to keep our promises, that we have begun to move against conditions under which one-third of this Nation is still ill-nourished, ill-clad and ill-housed.

We remember that we gave warning last November that we had only just begun to fight. (Applause) Did some people really believe that we did not mean it? Well -- I meant it, and you meant it. (Applause)

A few days ago, a distinguished member of the Congress came to see me to talk about national problems in general and about the problems of the Judiciary in particular. (Laughter)

I said to him:

no longer. We are celebrating the 1936 victory. That was not a final victory. It was a victory whereby our party won further opportunity to lead in the solution of the pressing problems that perplex our generation. Whether we shall celebrate in 1938, and in 1940, and in 1944, as we celebrate tonight, will deservedly depend upon whether the party continues on its course and solves these problems. (Applause)

And if I have aught to say about it, it will continue on its course and it will solve these problems. (Applause)

After election day in 1936, some of our supporters were uneasy, uneasy lest we grasp the excuse of a false era of good feeling to evade our obligations. They were worried by the evil symptom that the propaganda and the epithets of last summer and fall had died down.

Today, however, those who placed their confidence in us are reassured. (Applause) For the tumult and the shouting have broken forth anew -- and from substantially the same elements of opposition. This new roar -- for that is the best term -- is the best evidence in the world that we have begun to keep our promises, that we have begun to move against conditions under which one-third of this Nation is still ill-nourished, ill-clad and ill-housed.

We remember that we gave warning last November that we had only just begun to fight. (Applause) Did some people really believe that we did not mean it? Well -- I meant it, and you meant it. (Applause)

A few days ago, a distinguished member of the Congress came to see me to talk about national problems in general and about the problems of the Judiciary in particular. (Laughter)

I said to him:

"John, I want to tell you something that is very personal to me -- something that you have a right to hear from my own lips. I have a great ambition in life."

My friend pricked up his ears.

I went on: "I am by no means satisfied with having twice been elected President of the United States by very large majorities. I have an even greater ambition."

By this time, my friend was sitting on the edge of his chair. (Laughter)

I continued: "John," I said, "my ambition relates to January 20, 1941." And I could feel just what horrid thoughts my friend was thinking. (Laughter) So in order to relieve his anxiety, I went on to say: "My great ambition on January 20, 1941, is to turn over (this) the desk and chair in the White House, this desk and chair, to my successor, whoever he may be, with the assurance that I am at the same time turning over to him as President, a Nation intact, a Nation at peace, a Nation prosperous, a Nation clear in its knowledge of what power(s) it has to serve its own citizens, a Nation that is in a position to use those powers to the full in order to move forward steadily to meet the modern needs of humanity -- a Nation which has thus proved that the democratic form and methods of national government can and will succeed. (Applause, prolonged)

In these coming years I want to provide such assurance. I want to get the Nation as far along the road of progress as I can. I do not want to leave it to my successor in the condition in which Buchanan left it to Lincoln." (Applause)

My friends, that ambition of mine for my successor can well

be the serious ambition of every citizen who wants his United States to be handed down intact to his children and grandchildren.

I spoke in the dead earnestness of anxiety, I speak to you tonight in the same earnestness. For no one who sees as a whole today's picture of this Nation and the world can help but feel concern for the future.

To the President of the United States there come every day thousands of messages of appeal, of protest, of support, of information and advice, messages from rich and poor, from business man and farmer, from factory employee and relief worker, messages from every (corner) part of our wide (domain) land.

Those messages reflect the most striking feature of the life of this generation -- the feature which men who live mentally in another generation can least understand -- the ever-accelerating speed with which social forces now gather headway.

The issue of slavery, for example, took at least forty years -- two generations -- of argument, discussion and futile compromise, before it came to a head in the tragic War between the States.

But economic freedom for the wage earner and the farmer and the small business man will not wait, like emancipation, for forty years. It will not wait for four years. It will not wait at all. (Applause)

After the World War, there arose everywhere insistent demands upon government that human needs be met. The unthinking, or those who dwell in the past, have tried to block them. The wise who live in the present have recognized their innate justice, (and) their irresistible pressure -- and have sought to guide them.

In some countries, a royalist form of government failed to



meet these demands -- and fell. In other countries, a parliamentary form of government failed to meet these demands -- and fell. In still other countries, governments have managed to hold on, but civil strife has flared or threats of upheaval persist.

Democracy in many lands has failed for the time being to meet human needs. People have become so fed up with futile debate and party bickerings over methods that they have been willing to surrender democratic processes and principles in order to get things done. They have forgotten the lessons of history that the ultimate failures of dictatorships cost humanity far more than any temporary failures of democracy.

In the United States democracy has not yet failed and does not need to fail. (Applause) And we, (propose not) the leaders of the Democratic Party throughout the Nation, do not propose to let it fail! (Applause)

Nevertheless, I cannot tell you with complete candor that in these past few years democracy in the United States has fully succeeded. Nor can I tell you, under present circumstances, just where American democracy is headed nor just what it is permitted to do in order to insure its continued success and survival. I can only hope.

For as yet there is no definite assurance that the three horse team of the American system of government will pull together. (Applause and boos) If three well-matched horses are put to the task of ploughing up a field where the going is heavy, and the team of three pull as one, the field will be ploughed. If one horse lies down in the traces or plunges off in another direction, the field will not be ploughed. (Applause, cheers)

What you and I call the principles of the New Deal did not originate on the fourth of March, 1933. We think of that date as their beginning, because it was not until then that the social demands that they represented broke through the inertia of many years of failure to improve our political and economic processes.

What were those demands and needs? How far did we succeed in meeting them? And what about them today?

Ever since the World War the farmers of America had been beating off ever-mounting disasters. This Administration tried to help them effectively where no other Administration had dared to take that risk. (Applause)

The Agricultural Adjustment Act testified to our full faith and confidence that the very nature of our major crops of America makes them articles of commerce between the States. (Applause)

The (A.A.A.) Triple A testified also to our full faith and confidence that the preservation of sound agriculture is essential to the general welfare -- that the Congress of the United States had full constitutional authority to solve the national economic problems of the Nation's agriculture. And by overwhelming votes, the Congress thought so too! (Applause)

You know who assumed the power to veto, and did veto that program.

In the campaign of 1936, I said: "Of course we will continue our efforts in behalf of the farmers of America. With their continued cooperation we will do all in our power to end the piling up of huge surpluses (which) that spelled ruinous prices for their crops. We will persist in successful action for better land use, for reforestation,

\* \* \* for better marketing facilities for farm commodities, for a definite reduction of farm tenancy, for encouragement of farmer co-operatives, for crop insurance and a stable food supply. For all these things we have only just begun to fight." (Applause)

My friends, neither individually nor as a party can we postpone and run from that fight on the advice of defeatist lawyers. But I defy anyone to read the majority opinion invalidating the (A.A.A.) Triple A and tell us what we can do for agriculture in this session of the Congress with any reasonable certainty that what we do will not be nullified as unconstitutional. (Applause)

But the farmers were not the only people in distress in 1932. There were millions of workers in industry and in commerce who had lost their jobs, young people who had never been able to find their first job, and more millions whose jobs did not return them and their families enough to live on decently.

The Democratic Administration and the Congress made a gallant, sincere effort to raise wages, to reduce hours, to abolish child labor, and to eliminate unfair trade practices.

We tried to establish machinery to adjust the relations between the employer and employee.

And what happened?

You know who assumed the power to veto, and did veto that program.

The Railroad Retirement Act, the National Recovery Act and the Cuffey Coal Act were successively outlawed as the Child Labor Statute had been outlawed twenty years before.

Soon thereafter the Nation was told by a judicial pronuncia-

mento that although the Federal Government had (thus) been thus rendered powerless to touch the problem of hours and wages, the States were equally helpless; and that it pleased the "personal economic predilections" of a majority of the Court that we live in a Nation where there is no legal power anywhere to deal with its most difficult practical problems -- a No Man's Land of final futility. (Applause)

And, furthermore, -- for I am not through yet (applause) court injunctions have paralyzed the machinery (which) that we created by the National Labor Relations Act to settle great disputes raging in the industrial field, and, indeed, to prevent them from ever-arising. We hope that this Act may yet escape final condemnation in the highest court. But so far the attitude and the language of the courts in relation to many other laws have made the legality of this Act also uncertain, and have encouraged men and corporations to defy rather than to obey it.

In the campaign of 1936, you and I promised this to working men and women:

"Of course we will continue to seek to improve working conditions for the workers of America -- to reduce hours over-long, to increase wages that spell starvation, to end the labor of children, to wipe out sweatshops. \* \* \* we will provide useful work for the needy unemployed. And for all these things we have only just begun to fight."

(And) But here again we cannot afford, either individually or as a party, to postpone or run from that fight on the advice of defeatist lawyers. (Applause)

(But) And I defy anyone to read the opinions concerning (A.A.A.) Triple A, the Railroad Retirement Act, the National Recovery Act, the



Guffey Coal Act and the New York Minimum Wage Law, and tell us exactly what, if anything, we can do for the industrial worker in this session of the Congress with any reasonable certainty that what we do will not be nullified as unconstitutional. (Applause)

During the course of the past four years the Nation has been overwhelmed by disasters of flood and drought.

Modern science knows how to protect our land and our people from the recurrence of such catastrophes, and knows how to produce as a by-product the blessing of cheaper electric power for the Nation. With the Tennessee Valley Authority we made a beginning of that kind of protection on an intelligent regional basis and with only two of its nine projected dams completed there was no flood damage in the valley of the Tennessee this winter. (Applause)

But how can we confidently complete (that) the Tennessee Valley project (or), how can we extend the idea to the Ohio (and other valleys) and the Connecticut and many other rivers and valleys of the Nation while the lowest courts have not hesitated to paralyze its operations by sweeping injunctions?

My friends, the Ohio River and the Dust Bowl are not conversant with the habits of the Interstate Commerce Clause. (Applause) But we shall never be safe in our lives, in our property or in the heritage of our soil until we have somehow made the Interstate Commerce Clause conversant with the habits of the Ohio River and the Dust Bowl. (Laughter, applause)

In the campaign of 1936, you and I and all who supported us, men and women of all parties, we took (did take) cognizance of the Ohio River and the Dust Bowl. We said: "Of course we will continue our

delay creates risks of intervening events which make more and more difficult an intelligent, speedy, and democratic solution of our difficulties.

As Chief Executive and as head of the Democratic Party, I am unwilling to take those risks -- risks to the country and to the party -- of postponing one moment beyond absolute necessity the time when we can free from legal doubt those policies which offer a progressive solution of our problems. (Applause)

Floods and droughts and agricultural surpluses, strikes and industrial confusion and disorder, cannot be handled forever on a catch-as-catch-can basis. (Applause)

And, my friends, I have another ambition -- not so great an ambition as that which I have for the country, but an ambition which as a life-long Democrat, I do not believe unworthy. It is an ambition for the Democratic Party.

The Party, and its associates, have had the imagination to perceive essential unity below the surface of apparent diversity. We can, therefore, long remain a natural rallying point for the cooperative effort of all (of) those who truly believe in political and economic democracy.

It will take courage to let our minds be bold and find the ways to meet the current needs of the Nation. But for our Party, now as always, the counsel of courage is the counsel of wisdom. (Applause)

If we do not have the courage to lead the American people where they want to go, someone else will.

Here is one-third of a Nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed -- NOW!

delay creates risks of intervening events which make more and more difficult an intelligent, speedy, and democratic solution of our difficulties.

As Chief Executive and as head of the Democratic Party, I am unwilling to take those risks -- risks to the country and to the party -- of postponing one moment beyond absolute necessity the time when we can free from legal doubt those policies which offer a progressive solution of our problems. (Applause)

Floods and droughts and agricultural surpluses, strikes and industrial confusion and disorder, cannot be handled forever on a catch-as-catch-can basis. (Applause)

And, my friends, I have another ambition -- not so great an ambition as that which I have for the country, but an ambition which as a life-long Democrat, I do not believe unworthy. It is an ambition for the Democratic Party.

The Party, and its associates, have had the imagination to perceive essential unity below the surface of apparent diversity. We can, therefore, long remain a natural rallying point for the cooperative effort of all (of) those who truly believe in political and economic democracy.

It will take courage to let our minds be bold and find the ways to meet the current needs of the Nation. But for our Party, now as always, the counsel of courage is the counsel of wisdom. (Applause)

If we do not have the courage to lead the American people where they want to go, someone else will.

Here is one-third of a Nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed -- NOW!

Here are thousands upon thousands of farmers wondering whether next year's prices will meet their mortgage interest -- NOW!

Here are thousands upon thousands of men and women laboring for long hours in factories for inadequate pay -- NOW!

Here are thousands upon thousands of children who should be at school, working in mines and mills -- NOW!

Here are strikes more far-reaching than we have ever known, costing millions of dollars -- NOW!

Here are spring floods threatening to roll (again) down again upon our river valleys -- NOW!

Here is the Dust Bowl beginning to blow again -- NOW!

If we would keep faith, faith with those who had faith in us, if we would make democracy succeed, I say we must act -- NOW! (Applause, prolonged)



ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
delivered in the Sylvan Theatre (foot of  
Washington Monument) Washington, D.C.  
on the 150th Anniversary of the signing  
of the Constitution of the United States  
September 17, 1937, 9.30 P.M.

MY FELLOW AMERICANS:

It is very right, it is very fitting, that this great gathering has assembled tonight in the National Capital, at the foot of the Washington Monument.

(Tonight) 150 years ago tonight thirty-eight weary delegates to a Convention in Philadelphia signed the Constitution. Four hand-written sheets of parchment were enough to state the terms on which thirteen independent weak little republics agreed to try to survive together as one strong nation.

A third of the original delegates had given up and gone home. But the moral force of Washington and Franklin had kept the rest together. Those remained who cared the most; and caring most, dared most.

(The) That world of 1787 provided a perfect opportunity for the organization of a new form of Government thousands of miles removed from influences hostile to it. How we then governed ourselves did not greatly concern Europe. And what occurred in Europe did not immediately affect us.

But today the picture is different.

Now what we do has enormous immediate effect not only among the nations of Europe but also among those of the Americas and the Far East, and what in any part of the world they do as surely and quickly affects us.

In such an atmosphere our generation has watched democracies replace monarchies which had failed their people, and dictatorships displace democracies which had failed to function. And of late we have heard a clear challenge to the democratic idea of representative government.

We do not deny that the methods of the challengers -- whether they be called "communistic" or "dictatorial" or "military" -- have obtained for many who live under them material things they did not obtain under democracies which they had failed to make function. Unemployment has been lessened -- even though the cause is a mad manufacturing of armaments. Order prevails -- even though maintained by fear, at the expense of liberty and individual rights.

So their leaders laugh at all constitutions, predict the copying of their own methods, and prophesy the early end of democracy throughout the world.

But, my friends, both that attitude and that prediction are denied by those of us who still believe in democracy (applause) -- (that is) are denied by the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world and by the overwhelming majority of the people of the world. And the denial is based on two reasons, both of them eternally right.

The first reason is that modern men and women will not tamely commit to one man or one group of men the permanent conduct of their Government. Eventually they will insist not only on the right to choose who shall govern them but also upon the periodic reconsideration of that choice by the free exercise of the ballot. (Applause)

And the second reason is that the state of world affairs brought about by these new forms of government threatens civilization.

Armaments and deficits pile up together. Trade barriers multiply and merchant ships are threatened on the (high) seven seas. Fear spreads throughout the world -- fear of aggression, fear of invasion, fear of revolution, fear of death.

The people of America are rightly determined to keep that growing menace from (our) their shores.

The known, (and) the measurable danger of becoming involved in war we face confidently. As to that, your Government knows your mind, and you know your Government's mind. (Applause)

But it takes even more foresight, intelligence and patience to meet the subtle attack which spreading dictatorship makes upon the morale of a democracy.

In our generation, a new idea has come to dominate thought about government -- the idea that the resources of the nation can be made to produce a far higher standard of living for the masses of the people if only government is intelligent and energetic in giving the right direction to our economic life.

That idea -- or more properly that ideal -- is wholly justified by the facts. It cannot be thrust aside by those who want to go back to the conditions of ten years ago or even preserve the conditions of today. It puts all forms of government to proof.

That ideal makes understandable the demands of labor for shorter hours and higher wages, the demands of farmers for a more stable income, the demands of the great majority of business men for relief from disruptive trade practices, the demands of all for the ending of that kind of license, often misnamed "liberty," which permits a handful of the population to take far more than their

tolerable share from the rest of the people. (Applause)

And as other forms of government in other lands parade their pseudo-science of economic organization, even some of our own people may wonder whether democracy can match dictatorship in giving to this generation the things that they want from Government.

We have those who really fear the majority rule of democracy, who want old forms of economic and social control to remain in a few hands. They say in their hearts: "If constitutional democracy continues to threaten our control why should we be against a plutocratic dictatorship (which) if that would perpetuate our control?"

And we have those who are in too much of a hurry, who are impatient at the processes of constitutional democracies, who want Utopia overnight and are not sure that some vague form of proletarian dictatorship is not the quickest road to it.

My friends, both types are equally dangerous. (Applause)  
One of those types represents cold-blooded resolve to hold power. We have engaged in a definite, and so far successful, contest against that. (Applause) The other represents a reckless resolve to seize power. Equally we are against that.

And the overwhelming majority of the American people fully understand and completely approve that course as the course of the present Government of the United States.

To hold to that course our constitutional democratic form of government must meet the insistence of the great mass of our people that economic and social security and the standard of American living be raised from what they are to levels which the people know our resources justify.



Only by succeeding in that can we ensure against internal doubt as to the worthwhileness of our democracy and dissipate the illusion that the necessary price of efficiency is dictatorship with its attendant spirit of aggression.

That is why I have been saying for many months that there is a crisis in American affairs which demands action now -- a crisis particularly dangerous because its external and internal difficulties reenforce each other.

Purposely I paint a broad picture. For only if the problem is seen in perspective can we see its solution in perspective.

I am not a pessimist. I believe that democratic government in this country can do all the things which common-sense people, seeing that picture as a whole, have the right to expect. I believe that these things can be done under the Constitution (applause) -- yes, under the Constitution, without the surrender of a single one of the civil and religious liberties it was intended to safeguard.

And I am determined that under the Constitution these things shall be done. (Applause)

Let us remember that the men who wrote the Constitution were the men who fought the Revolution. They had watched a weak emergency Government almost lose the war, and continue economic distress among those thirteen little republics -- at peace but without effective national government.

So when these men planned a new Government, they drew the kind of agreement which men make when they really want to work together under it for a very long time.

For the youngest of nations they drew what is today the

oldest written instrument under which men have continuously lived together as a nation.

The Constitution of the United States was a laymen's document, not a lawyer's contract. (Applause) That cannot be stressed too often. And I am glad you get the point. (Applause) Madison, most responsible for (it) the drafting of the Constitution, was not a lawyer -- nor was Washington or Franklin, whose sense of the give-and-take of life had kept the Convention together.

This great laymen's document, therefore, was a charter of general principles -- completely different from the "whereases" and the "parties of the first part" and the fine print which lawyers put into leases and insurance policies and installment agreements. (Laughter, applause)

When the framers were dealing with what they rightly considered eternal verities, unchangeable by time and circumstance, they used specific language. In no uncertain terms, for instance, they forbade titles of nobility, the suspension of habeas corpus, (and) the withdrawal of money from the Treasury except after appropriation by law. With almost equal definiteness they detailed the Bill of Rights.

But when they considered the fundamental powers of the new national Government they used generality, implication and statement of mere objectives, as intentional phrases which flexible statesmanship of the future, within the Constitution, could adapt to time and circumstance. For instance, the framers used broad and general language capable of meeting evolution and change when they referred to commerce between the states, the taxing power and the general welfare.

Yes, even the Supreme Court was treated with that purposeful

lack of specification. (Applause) Contrary to the belief of many, many Americans, the Constitution says nothing about any power of the Court to declare legislation unconstitutional (applause); nor, parenthetically, does it mention the number of judges for the Court. (Applause, laughter) (Again and again) Four times, four times the Constitutional Convention voted down proposals to give Justices of the Court a veto over legislation. Clearly a majority of the delegates believed that the relation of the Court to the Congress and the Executive, like the other subjects treated in general terms, would work itself out by evolution and change over all the years.

But for (one) a hundred and fifty years we have had an unending struggle between those who would preserve this original broad concept of the Constitution as a layman's instrument of government and those who would shrivel the Constitution into a lawyer's contract, read it as if it were the fine print on the back of your insurance policy. (Applause)

Those of us who really believe in the enduring wisdom of the Constitution, we hold no rancor against those who professionally or politically talk and think in purely legalistic phrases. We cannot seriously be alarmed when they cry "unconstitutional" at every effort to better the condition of our people.

Such cries, such cries have always been with us -- and, ultimately, they have always been overruled.

Lawyers distinguished in 1787 insisted that the Constitution itself was unconstitutional under the Articles of Confederation. (Applause) But the ratifying conventions overruled them.

Lawyers distinguished in their day warned Washington and

Hamilton that the protective tariff was unconstitutional -- warned Jefferson that the Louisiana Purchase was unconstitutional -- warned Monroe that to open up roads across the Alleghenies was unconstitutional. But the Executive and the Congress overruled them.

Lawyers distinguished in their day persuaded a divided Supreme Court that the Congress had no power to govern slavery in the territories, that the long-standing Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. But a war between the states overruled them.

Lawyers (distinguished) in their day persuaded the Odd Man on the Supreme Court that the methods of financing the Civil War were unconstitutional. But a new Odd Man overruled them. (Laughter, applause)

That great Senatorial constitutional authority of his day, Senator Evarts, issued a solemn warning that the proposed Interstate Commerce Act and the Federal regulation of railway rates which the farmers demanded would be unconstitutional. But both the Senate and the Supreme Court overruled him.

Less than two years ago fifty-eight of the highest priced lawyers in the land gave the Nation (without cost to the Nation) a solemn and formal opinion that the Wagner Labor Relations Act was unconstitutional. And in a few months, first a national election and (later) then the Supreme Court itself overruled them. (Laughter, applause)

For twenty years the Odd Man on the Supreme Court refused to admit that state minimum wage laws for women were constitutional. A few months ago, after my message to the Congress on the rejuvenation of the Judiciary, the Odd Man admitted that the Court had been wrong -- for all those twenty years -- and overruled himself. (Laughter, applause)



My friends, in this test, this constant struggle the lawyers of no political party -- mine or any other -- have had a consistent or unblemished record. But the lay rank and file of political parties, outside political parties, has had a consistent record.

Unlike some lawyers, they have respected as sacred all branches of their Government. They have seen nothing more sacred about (one) that branch furthest removed from the people than about either of the others which are nearest to the people. They have considered as most sacred the concrete welfare of the generation of the day. And with laymen's common sense of what government is for, they have demanded that all three branches be efficient -- that all three be interdependent as well as independent -- (and) that all three work together to meet the living generation's expectations of government.

That lay rank and file can take cheer from the historic fact that every effort to construe the Constitution as a lawyer's contract rather than a layman's charter has ultimately failed. Whenever legalistic interpretation has clashed with contemporary sense on great questions of broad national policy, ultimately the people and the Congress have had their way.

But that word "ultimately" covers a terrible cost.

It cost a Civil War to gain recognition of the constitutional power of the Congress to legislate for the territories.

It cost twenty years of taxation on those least able to pay to recognize the constitutional power of the Congress to levy taxes on those most able to pay.

It cost twenty years of exploitation of women's labor to

recognize the constitutional power of the states to pass minimum wage laws for their protection.

It has cost twenty years already -- and no one knows how many more are to come -- to obtain a constitutional interpretation that will let the Nation regulate the shipment in national commerce of goods sweated from the labor of little children. (Applause)

Yes, we know that it takes time to adjust government to the needs of society. But modern history proves that reforms too long delayed or denied have jeopardized peace, undermined democracy and swept away civil and religious liberties.

Yes, time more than ever before is vital in statesmanship and in government -- in all three branches of it.

We will no longer be permitted to sacrifice each generation in turn while the law catches up with life.

We can no longer afford the luxury of twenty-year lags.

And you will find no justification in any of the language of the Constitution for delay in the reforms which the mass of the American people now demand.

Yet nearly every attempt to meet those demands for social and economic betterment has been jeopardized or actually forbidden by those who have sought to read into the Constitution language which the framers refused to write into the Constitution.

No one cherishes more deeply than I the civil and religious liberties achieved by so much blood and anguish through the many centuries of Anglo-American history. But the Constitution guarantees liberty, not license masquerading as liberty.

Let me put the real situation in the simplest terms. The

present Government of the United States has never taken away and never will take away any liberty from any minority, unless it be a minority which so abuses its liberty as to do positive and definite harm to its neighbors constituting (the) a majority. (But) And the Government of the United States refuses to forget that the Bill of Rights was put into the Constitution not only to protect minorities against intolerance of majorities, but to protect majorities against the enthronement of minorities.

Nothing would so surely destroy the substance of what the Bill of Rights protects than its perversion to prevent social progress. The surest protection of the individual and of minorities is that fundamental tolerance, (and) that fundamental feeling for fair play which the Bill of Rights assumes. But tolerance and fair play would disappear here as it has in some other lands if the great mass of people were denied confidence in their justice, confidence in their security, confidence in their self-respect. Desperate people in other lands surrendered their liberties when freedom came merely to mean humiliation and starvation. The crisis of 1933 (should) ought to make us understand that.

And so, my friends, on this solemn anniversary I ask that the American people rejoice in the wisdom of their Constitution.

I ask that they guarantee the effectiveness of each of its parts by living by the Constitution as a whole.

I ask that they have faith, faith in its ultimate capacity to work out the problems of democracy, but that they justify that faith by making it work now rather than twenty long years from now.

(Applause)

I ask that they give their fealty to the Constitution itself and not to its misinterpreters.

I ask that they exalt the glorious simplicity of its purposes rather than a century of complicated legalism.

I ask that majorities and minorities subordinate intolerance and power alike to the common good of all.

For us the Constitution is a common bond, without bitterness, a bond for those who see America as Lincoln saw it "the last, best hope of earth."

So we revere it -- not because it is old but because it is ever new -- not in the worship of its past alone but in the faith of the living who keep it young, young now (and) young in the years to come. (Applause, prolonged)



ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
at the dedication of the Outerlink Bridge  
over the mouth of the Chicago River  
Chicago, Illinois  
October 5, 1937, 11.15 A.M., C.T.

MAYOR KELLY, GOVERNOR HONNER, MY FRIENDS IN CHICAGO:

I am glad to come once again to Chicago and especially to have the opportunity of taking part in the dedication of this important project of civic betterment.

I congratulate Chicago and Cook County on the opening of this splendid bridge and of these thirty miles of lake front boulevard.

On my trip across the continent and back I have been shown many evidences of the result of common-sense cooperation between municipalities and the Federal Government, and I have been greeted by tens of thousands of Americans who have told me in every look and word that their material and spiritual well-being has made great strides forward in the past few years.

And yet, as I have seen with my own eyes, the prosperous farms, the thriving factories and the busy railroads -- as I have seen the happiness and security and especially the peace which covers our wide land, almost inevitably I have been compelled to contrast our peace with very different scenes that are being enacted in other parts of the world.

It is because the people of the United States (under modern conditions) must, for the sake of their own future, give thought to the rest of the world, that I, as the responsible executive head of the Nation, have chosen this great inland city and this gala occasion

to speak to you on a subject of definite national importance.

The political situation in the world, which of late has been growing progressively worse, is such as to cause grave concern and anxiety to all the peoples and nations who wish to live in peace and amity with their neighbors.

Some fifteen years ago the hopes of mankind for a continuing era of international peace were raised to great heights when more than sixty nations solemnly pledged themselves not to resort to arms in furtherance of their national aims and policies. The high aspirations expressed in the Briand-Kellogg Peace Pact and the hopes for peace thus raised have of late given way to a haunting fear of calamity. The present reign of terror and international lawlessness began a few years ago.

It began through unjustified interference in the internal affairs of other nations or the invasion of alien territory in violation of treaties. (and) It has now reached a stage where the very foundations of civilization are seriously threatened. The landmarks, (and) the traditions which have marked the progress of civilization toward(s) a condition of law and order and justice are being wiped away.

Without a declaration of war and without warning or justification of any kind civilians, including vast numbers of women and children, are being ruthlessly murdered with bombs from the air. In times of so-called peace ships are being attacked and sunk by submarines without cause or notice. Nations are fomenting and taking sides in civil warfare in nations that have never done them any harm. Nations claiming freedom for themselves deny it to others.

Innocent peoples, (and) innocent nations are being cruelly

sacrificed to a greed for power and supremacy which is devoid of all sense of justice and humane consideration.

To paraphrase a recent author "perhaps we foresee a time when men, exultant in the technique of homicide, will rage so hotly over the world that every precious thing will be in danger, every book (and) every picture, (and) every harmony, every treasure garnered through two milleniums, the small, the delicate, the defenseless -- all will be lost or wrecked or utterly destroyed."

If these things come to pass in other parts of the world, let no one imagine that America will escape, that America may expect mercy, that this Western Hemisphere will not be attacked and that it will continue tranquilly and peacefully to carry on the ethics and the arts of civilization.

No, if those days come "there will be no safety by arms, no help from authority, no answer in science. The storm will rage till every flower of culture is trampled and all human beings are leveled in a vast chaos."

If those days are not to come to pass -- if we are to have a world in which we can breathe freely and live in amity without fear -- then the peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort to uphold laws and principles on which alone peace can rest secure. (Applause)

The peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort in opposition to those violations of treaties and those ignorings of humane instincts which today are creating a state of international anarchy, (and) international instability from which there is no escape through mere isolation or neutrality.

Those who cherish their freedom and recognize and respect the equal rights of their neighbors to be free and live in peace, must work together for the triumph of law and moral principles in order that peace, justice and confidence may prevail (in) throughout the world. There must be a return to a belief in the pledged word, in the value of a signed treaty. There must be recognition of the fact that national morality is as vital as private morality. (Applause)

A bishop wrote to me the other day: "It seems to me that something greatly needs to be said in behalf of ordinary humanity against the present practice of carrying the horrors of war to help-less civilians, especially women and children. It may be that such a protest (might) may be regarded by many, who claim to be realists, as futile, but may it not be that the heart of mankind is so filled with horror at the present needless suffering that that force could be mobilized in sufficient volume to lessen such cruelty in the days ahead. Even though it may take twenty years, which God forbid, for civilization to make effective its corporate protest against this barbarism, surely strong voices may hasten the day."

There is a solidarity, (and) an interdependence about the modern world, both technically and morally, which makes it impossible for any nation completely to isolate itself from political and economic (and political) upheavals in the rest of the world, especially when such upheavals appear to be spreading and not declining. There can be no stability or peace either within nations or between nations except under laws and moral standards adhered to by all. International anarchy destroys every foundation for peace. It jeopardizes either the immediate or the future security of every nation, large or small.



And it is, therefore, a matter of vital interest and concern to the people of the United States that the sanctity of international treaties and the maintenance of international morality be restored.

The overwhelming majority of all the peoples and nations of the world today want to live in peace. They seek the removal of barriers against trade. They want to exert themselves in industry, in agriculture, (and) in business, that they may increase their wealth through the production of wealth-producing goods rather than striving to produce military planes and bombs and machine guns and cannon for the destruction of human lives and useful property.

In those nations of the world which seem to be piling armament on armament for purposes of aggression, and those other nations which fear acts of aggression against them and their security, a very high proportion of their national income is being spent directly for armaments. It runs from thirty to as high as fifty per cent in most of those cases.

We are fortunate. The proportion that we spend in the United States (spend) is far less -- eleven or twelve per cent.

How happy we are that the circumstances of the moment permit us to put our money into bridges and boulevards, dams and reforestation, the conservation of our soil and many other kinds of useful works rather than into huge standing armies and vast supplies of implements of war. (Applause)

Nevertheless, my friends, I am compelled and you are compelled (nevertheless) to look ahead. The peace, the freedom, (and) the security of ninety per cent of the population of the world is being jeopardized by the remaining ten per cent who are threatening

a breakdown of all international order and law. Surely the ninety per cent who want to live in peace under law and in accordance with moral standards that have received almost universal acceptance through the centuries, can and must find some way to make their will prevail.

Yes, the situation is definitely of universal concern. The questions involved relate not merely to violations of specific provisions of particular treaties; they are questions of war and (of) peace, of international law and especially of principles of humanity. It is true that they involve definite violations of agreements, and especially of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Briand-Kellogg Pact and the Nine Power Treaty. And we have signed both of the last two. But they (also) involve also problems of world economy, world security and world humanity.

It is true that the moral consciousness of the world must recognize the importance of removing injustices and well-founded grievances; but at the same time it must be aroused to the cardinal necessity of honoring sanctity of treaties, of respecting the rights and liberties of others and of putting an end to acts of international aggression.

It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading.

And mark this well! When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread, the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease. (Applause)

It is my determination to pursue a policy of peace. It is my determination to (and) adopt every practicable measure to avoid

involvement in war. (Applause) It ought to be inconceivable that in this modern era, and in the face of experience, any nation could be so foolish and ruthless as to run the risk of plunging the whole world into war by invading and violating in contravention of solemn treaties, the territory of other nations that have done them no real harm and which are too weak to protect themselves adequately. Yet the peace of the world and the welfare and security of every nation, including our own, is today being threatened by that very thing.

No nation which refuses to exercise forbearance and to respect the freedom and rights of others can long remain strong and retain the confidence and respect of other nations. No nation ever loses its dignity or its good standing by conciliating its differences, and by exercising great patience, patience with, and consideration for, the rights of other nations.

War is a contagion, whether it be declared or undeclared. It can engulf states and peoples remote from the original scene of hostilities. Yes, we are determined to keep out of war, yet we cannot insure ourselves against the disastrous effects of war and the dangers of involvement. We are adopting such measures as will minimize our risk of involvement but we cannot have complete protection in a world of disorder in which confidence and security have broken down.

If civilization is to survive the principles of the Prince of Peace must be restored. Shattered trust between nations must be revived.

Most important of all, the will for peace on the part of peace-loving nations must express itself to the end that nations

that may be tempted to violate their agreements and the rights of others will desist from such a cause. There must be positive endeavors to preserve peace.

America hates war. (Applause) America -- (applause)  
America hopes for peace. Therefore, America actively engages in the search for peace.



ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
To the Congress of the United States  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.  
January 4, 1939, 1.00 P. M.

(TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:)

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Senate  
and the Congress:

In reporting on the state of the nation, I have felt it necessary on previous occasions to advise the Congress of disturbance abroad and of the need of putting our own house in order in the face of storm signals from across the seas. As this Seventy-Sixth Congress opens there is need for further warning.

A war which threatened to envelop the world in flames has been averted: but it has become increasingly clear that world peace is not assured.

All about us rage undeclared wars -- military and economic. All about us grow more deadly armaments -- military and economic. All about us are threats of new aggression -- military and economic.

Storms from abroad directly challenge three institutions indispensable to Americans, now as always. The first is religion. (It) Religion is the source of the other two -- democracy and international good faith.

Religion, by teaching man his relationship to God, gives the individual a sense of his own dignity and teaches him to respect himself by respecting his neighbors.

Democracy, the practice of self-government, is a covenant among free men to respect the rights and liberties of their fellows.

International good faith, a sister of democracy, springs from the will of civilized nations of men to respect the rights and liberties of other nations of men.

In a modern civilization, all three -- religion, democracy and international good faith -- complement and support each other.

Where freedom of religion has been attacked, the attack has come from sources opposed to democracy. Where democracy has been overthrown, the spirit of free worship has disappeared. And where religion and democracy have vanished, good faith and reason in international affairs have given way to strident ambition and brute force.

An ordering of society which relegates religion, democracy and good faith among nations to the background can find no place within it for the ideals of the Prince of Peace. The United States rejects such an ordering, and retains its ancient faith. (Applause)

There comes a time in the affairs of men when they must prepare to defend not their homes alone but the tenets of faith and humanity on which their churches, their governments and their (very civilization are founded) very foundations are set. The defense of religion, of democracy and of good faith among nations is all the same fight. To

save one we must now make up our minds to save all. (Applause)

And we know what might happen to us of the United States if the new philosophies of force were to encompass the other continents and invade our own. We, no more than other nations, can afford to be surrounded by the enemies of our faith and our humanity. Fortunate it is, therefore, that in this Western Hemisphere we have, under a common ideal of democratic government, a rich diversity of resources and of peoples functioning together in mutual respect and peace.

That Hemisphere, that peace, and that ideal we propose to do our share in protecting against storms from any quarter. Our people and our resources are pledged to secure that protection. And from that determination no American flinches. (Applause)

This by no means implies that the American Republics disassociate themselves from the nations of other continents -- it does not mean the Americans against the rest of the world. We as one of the Republics reiterate our willingness to help the cause of world peace. We stand on our long historic offer to take counsel with all other nations of the world to the end that aggression among them may be terminated, that the race of armaments cease and that commerce be renewed.

But the world has grown so small and the weapons of attack so swift that no nation can be safe in its will to peace so long as any other (single) powerful nation

refuses to settle its grievances at the council table.

For if any government bristling with implements of war insists on policies of force, weapons of defense give the only safety.

In our foreign relations we have learned from the past what not to do. From new wars we have learned what we must do.

We have learned that effective timing of defense, and the distant points from which attacks may be launched are completely different from what they were twenty years ago.

We have learned that survival cannot be guaranteed by arming after the attack begins -- for there is new range (and) new speed to offense.

We have learned that long before any overt military act, aggression begins with preliminaries of propaganda, subsidized penetration, the loosening of ties of good will, the stirring of prejudice and the incitement to disunion.

We have learned that God-fearing democracies of the world which observe the sanctity of treaties and good faith in their dealings with other nations cannot safely be indifferent to international lawlessness anywhere. (Applause) No, they cannot forever let pass, without effective protest, acts of aggression against sister nations -- acts which automatically undermine all of us.

Obviously they must proceed along practical, peace-



ful lines. But the mere fact that we rightly decline to intervene with arms to prevent acts of aggression does not mean that we must act as if there were no aggression at all. (Applause) Words may be futile, but war is not the only means of commanding a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. There are many methods short of war, but stronger and more effective than mere words, of bringing home to aggressor governments the aggregate sentiments of our own people.

At the very least, we can and should avoid any action, or any lack of action, which will encourage, assist or build up an aggressor. We have learned that when we deliberately try to legislate neutrality, our neutrality laws may operate unevenly and unfairly -- may actually give aid to an aggressor and deny it to the victim. The instinct of self-preservation should warn us that we ought not to let that happen any more. (Applause)

And we have learned something else -- the old, old lesson that probability of attack is mightily decreased by the assurance of an ever ready defense (Applause) Since 1931, nearly eight years ago, world events of thunderous import have moved with lightning speed. During these eight years many of our people clung to the hope that the innate decency of mankind would protect the unprepared who showed their innate trust in mankind. Today we are all wiser -- and sadder.

Under modern conditions what we mean by "adequate defense" -- a policy subscribed to by all of us -- must be divided into three elements. First we must have armed forces and defenses strong enough to ward off any sudden attack against strategic positions and key facilities essential to ensure sustained resistance and ultimate victory. Secondly we must have the organization and the location of those key facilities so that they may be immediately utilized and rapidly expanded to meet all needs without danger of serious interruption by enemy attack.

In the course of a few days I shall send to you a special message making recommendations for those two essentials of defense against danger which we cannot safely assume will not come.

If these first two essentials are reasonably provided for, we must be able confidently to invoke the third element, the underlying strength of citizenship -- the self-confidence, the ability, the imagination and the devotion that give the staying power to see things through.

A strong and united nation may be destroyed if it is unprepared against sudden attack. But even a nation well armed and well organized from a strictly military (standpoint) point of view, may, after a period of time, meet defeat if it is unnerved by self-distrust, endangered by class prejudice, by dissension between capital and labor, by false economy and by other unsolved social problems at home.

In meeting the troubles of the world we must meet them as one people -- with a unity born of the fact that for generations those who have come to our shores, representing many kindreds and tongues, have been welded by common opportunity into a united patriotism. If another form of government can present a united front in its attack on a democracy, the attack must and will be met by a united democracy. Such a democracy can and must exist in the United States. (Applause)

A dictatorship may command the full strength of a regimented nation. But the united strength of a democratic nation can be mustered only when its people, educated by modern standards to know what is going on and where they are going, have conviction that they are receiving as large a share of opportunity for development, as large a share of material success and of human dignity, as they have a right to receive.

Our nation's program of social and economic reform is therefore a part of defense, a part as basic as armaments themselves.

Against the background of events in Europe, in Africa and in Asia during these recent years, the pattern of what we here have accomplished since 1933 appears in even clearer focus.

For the first time we have moved upon deep-seated problems affecting our national strength and have forged

national instruments adequate to meet them.

Consider what the seemingly piecemeal struggles of these six years add up to in terms of realistic national preparedness.

We are conserving and developing natural resources -- land, water, power, forests.

We are trying to provide necessary food, shelter and medical care for the good, for the health of our population.

We are putting agriculture -- our system of food and fibre supply -- on a sounder basis.

We are strengthening the weakest spot in our system of industrial supply -- its long smouldering labor difficulties.

We have cleaned up our credit system so that depositor and investor alike may more readily and willingly make their capital available for peace or war.

We are giving to our youth new opportunities for work and education.

We have sustained the morale of all the population by the dignified recognition of our obligations to the aged, the helpless and the needy.

Above all, we have made the American people conscious of their interrelationship (and), their interdependence. They sense a common destiny -- and a common need of each other. Differences of occupation, geography, race,



(and) religion no longer obscure the nation's fundamental unity in thought and in action.

We have our difficulties, true -- but we are a wiser and a tougher nation than we were in 1939, or in 1932. (Applause)

Never have there been six years of such far-flung internal preparedness in our history. And (all) this has been done without any dictator's power to command, without conscription of labor or confiscation of capital, without concentration camps and without a scratch on freedom of speech, freedom of the press or the rest of the Bill of Rights.

And I think we see things now that we could not see so well along the way. The tools of government which we had in 1933 are outmoded. We have had to forge new tools for a new role of government operating in a democracy -- a role of new responsibility for new needs and increased responsibility for old needs, long neglected.

Some of these tools had to be roughly shaped and still need (some) machining down. Many of these who fought bitterly against the forging of these new tools welcome their use today. The American people, as a whole, have accepted them. The Nation looks to the Congress to improve the new machinery which we have permanently installed, provided that in the process the social usefulness of the machinery is not destroyed or impaired. (Applause)

Yes, all of us agree that we should simplify and improve laws if experience and operation clearly demonstrate the need. For instance, all of us want better provision for our older people under our social security legislation. For the medically needy we must provide better care.

Most of us agree that for the sake of employer and employee alike we must find ways to end factional labor strife and employer-employee disputes.

Most of us recognize that none of these tools can be put to maximum effectiveness unless the executive processes of government are revamped -- reorganized, if you will -- into more effective combination. (Applause) And even after such reorganization it will take time to develop administrative personnel and experience in order to use our new tools with a minimum of mistakes. The Congress, of course, needs no further information on this. (Laughter, applause)

With this exception of legislation to provide greater government efficiency, and with the exception of legislation to ameliorate our railroad and other transportation problems, the past three Congresses have met in part or in whole the pressing needs of the new order of things. (Applause)

We have now passed the period of internal conflict in the launching of our program of social reform. Our full energies may now be released to invigorate the processes of recovery in order to preserve our reforms, and to give

every man and woman who wants to work a real job at a living wage. (Applause)

But time is of paramount importance. The deadline of danger from within and from without is not within our control. The hour-glass may be in the hands of other nations. Our own hour-glass tells us that we are off on a race to make democracy work, so that we may be efficient in peace and therefore secure in (self) national defense.

This time element forces us to still greater efforts to attain the full employment of our labor and our capital.

The first duty of our statesmanship (today) is to bring capital and man-power together.

Dictatorships do this by main force. By using main force they apparently succeed at it -- for the moment. However, we abhor their methods, we are compelled to admit that they have obtained substantial utilization of all their material and human resources. Like it or not they have solved, for a time at least, the problem of idle men and idle capital. Can we compete with them by boldly seeking methods of putting idle men and idle capital together and, at the same time, remain within our American way of life, within the Bill of Rights, and within the bounds of what is, from our point of view, civilization itself?

We suffer from a great unemployment of capital. Many people have the idea that as a nation we are overbur-

dened with debt and are spending more than we can afford. That is not so. Despite our Federal Government expenditures the entire debt of our national economic system, public and private together, is no larger today than it was in 1929, and the interest thereon is far less than it was in 1929. (Applause)

And so the object is to put capital -- private as well as public -- to work.

We want to get enough capital and labor at work to give us a total turnover of business, a total national income, of at least eighty billion dollars a year. At that figure we shall have a substantial reduction of unemployment; and the Federal Revenues will be sufficient to balance the current level of cash expenditures on the basis of the existing tax structure. That figure can be attained, working within the framework of our traditional profit system.

The factors in attaining and maintaining that amount of national income are, it is true, many and complicated.

They include more widespread understanding among business men of many changes which world conditions and technological improvements have brought to our economy over the last twenty years -- changes in the interrelationship of price and volume and employment, for (instance) example -- changes of the kind in which business men are now educating themselves through excellent opportunities like the so-called



"monopoly investigation".

They include a perfecting of our farm program to protect farmers' income and consumers' purchasing power from alternate risks of crop gluts and crop shortages.

They include wholehearted acceptance of new standards of honesty in our financial markets.

They include reconciliation of enormous, antagonistic interests -- some of them long in litigation -- in the railroad and the general transportation field.

They include the working out of new techniques -- private, state and federal -- to protect the public interest in and to develop wider markets for electric power.

They include a revamping of the tax relationships between federal, and state and local units of government, and consideration of relatively small tax increases to adjust inequalities without interfering with the aggregate income of the American people.

They include the perfecting of labor organization and a universal ungrudging attitude by employers toward the labor movement, until there is a minimum of interruption of production and employment because of disputes, and acceptance by labor of the truth that the welfare of labor itself depends on increased balanced out-put of goods.

To be immediately practical, while proceeding with a steady evolution in the solving of these and like problems, we must wisely use instrumentalities, like Federal invest-

ment, which are immediately available to us.

And here, as elsewhere, time is the deciding factor in our choice of remedies.

Therefore, it does not seem logical to me, at the moment we seek to increase production and consumption, for the Federal Government to consider a drastic curtailment of its own investments. (Applause)

The whole subject of government investing and government income is one which may be approached in two different ways.

The first calls for the elimination of enough activities of government to bring the expenses of government immediately into balance with income of government. (Applause -- cheers) This school of thought maintains that because our national income this year is only sixty billion dollars, ours is only a sixty billion dollar country; (applause -- cheers) that government must treat it as such; and that without the help of government, it may some day, somehow, happen to become an eighty billion dollar country. (Applause -- cheers)

And the important point is that if the Congress decides to accept this point of view, it will logically have to reduce the present functions or activities of government by one-third. (Applause) Not only will the Congress (will) have to accept the responsibility for such reduction; (and) but the Congress will have to determine which activi-

ties are to be reduced. (Prolonged applause -- cheers)

Certain expenditures, I believe, we cannot possibly reduce at this session, such as the interest on the public debt. A few million dollars saved here or there in the normal or in curtailed work of the old departments and commissions will make no great saving in the Federal budget. Therefore, the Congress would have to reduce drastically some of certain large items, very large items, such as aids to agriculture and soil conservation, veterans' pensions, flood control, highway(s) aids, waterways and other public works, grants for social and health security, Civilian Conservation Corps activities, relief for the unemployed, or national defense itself.

The Congress alone has the power to do all this, as it is the appropriating branch of the government. (Applause)

The other approach to the question of government spending takes the position that this Nation ought not to be and need not be only a sixty billion dollar nation; (applause) that at this moment it has the men and the resources sufficient to make it at least an eighty billion dollar nation. This school of thought does not believe that it can become an eighty billion dollar nation in the near future if government cuts its operations by one-third. It is convinced that if we were to try it, we would invite disaster -- and that we would not long remain even a sixty billion dollar nation. (Applause) There are many compli-

cated factors with which we have to deal, but we have learned that it is unsafe to make abrupt reductions at any time in our net expenditure program.

By our common sense action of resuming government activities last Spring, we have reversed a recession and started the new rising tide of prosperity and national income which we are now just beginning to enjoy. (Applause)

If government activities are fully maintained, there (is a) are, definitely, good prospects of our becoming an eighty billion dollar country in a very short time. With such a national income, present tax laws will yield enough each year to balance each year's expenses.

It is my conviction that down in their hearts the American public -- industry, agriculture, finance -- wants this Congress to do whatever needs to be done to raise our national income to eighty billion dollars a year. (Applause)

Investing soundly must preclude spending wastefully. To guard against opportunist appropriations, I have on several occasions addressed the Congress on the importance of permanent long-range planning. I hope, therefore, that following my recommendation of last year, a permanent agency will be set up and authorized to report on the urgency and on the desirability of the various types of government investment.

Yes, investment for prosperity can be made in a democracy. (Applause)



I hear some people say "This is all so complicated. There are certain advantages in a dictatorship. It gets rid of labor trouble, it gets rid of unemployment, of wasted motion and of having to do your own thinking".

My answer is "yes, but it also gets rid of some other things which we Americans intend very definitely to keep -- and we still intend to do our own thinking". (Applause)

It will cost us taxes and the voluntary risk of capital to attain some of the practical advantages which other forms of government have acquired.

Dictatorship, however, involves costs which the American people will never pay: The cost of our spiritual values. The cost of the blessed right of being able to say what we please. The cost of freedom of religion. The cost of seeing our capital confiscated. The cost of being cast into a concentration camp. The cost of being afraid to walk down the street with the wrong neighbor. The cost of having our children brought up not as free and dignified human beings, but as pawns molded and enslaved by a machine.

If the avoidance of these costs means taxes on my income; if avoiding these costs means taxes on my estate at death, I would bear those taxes willingly as the price of my breathing and my children breathing the free air of a free country, as the price of a living and not a dead world. (Prolonged applause -- cheers)

Events (abroad) across the sea have made it increasingly clear to the American people that dangers within are less to be feared than dangers from without. If therefore a solution of this problem of idle men and idle capital is the price of preserving our liberty, no formless selfish fears can stand in (our) the way.

Once I prophesied that this generation of Americans had a rendezvous with destiny. That prophesy comes true. To us much is given; more is expected.

This generation will "nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope of earth ..... The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just -- a way which if followed the world will forever applaud and God must forever bless". (Applause)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
Jackson Day Dinner  
Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.  
January 7, 1939, 9.30 P.M.

CHAIRMAN FARLEY, MR. RICE, PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

Tonight is one of those rare occasions when from now on, or from half an hour on, I am going to have a good time. Because I am comparatively at the beginning of the program, I can enjoy the subsequent speeches.

Last night I was thinking about this gathering, about our Democratic Party, and what we ought to do to help it. And I decided to go right to headquarters -- not to Jim Farley's headquarters, something much further back. So I put in a radio call for General Andrew Jackson. (Applause)

"Young fellow," he said to me, "I don't know what's bothering you."

I said, "General, (said I, you see) it's about the Democratic Party. I'm very fond of it myself, but the Republicans are saying that it's rotting away like a pollywog's tail, and some of our fellows are worried. Is there anything that we ought to do about it?"

"Son," replied the General, "my eyes are getting old and I'm some distance away, but from what I can see from here the only trouble with your fellows is that they've been feeding (too) pretty well and they scare easily. (Laughter)

"And young fellow, do you realize that if you live out the term you now have, you'll be the only President of any party who's had two full terms with a majority of his own party in both the House and the Senate all the time, (applause) the only President since -- who do

you suppose? -- why, son, since James Monroe -- and he left the White House nearly one hundred and fourteen years ago! (Applause)

"Why," said General Jackson, "Woodrow Wilson didn't have majorities as safe as you have now when he first came into office.

"And as for me, son, my Democrats licked old Nick Biddle when we didn't even have a majority in the Senate and had a few votes only to spare in the House. Tell your fellows to (learn to) count. Some of you Democrats today get scared and let the other fellows tell you you've lost an election just because you don't have majorities so big that you can go to sleep without sentries.

"Why, there is nothing wrong with you fellows. Tell them to learn how to count and get to shooting at the enemy again and they will be all right." (Applause)

So, I am passing on that (the) advice of Old Hickory.  
(Laughter)

But despite the General's optimism, I still think this is a good time for the Democratic Party to "examine its conscience," to think over most seriously what we have done that we shouldn't (not) have done, and what we have left undone that we should have done.

Let us start by being realistic.

From 1920 on, the Republican Party fed too well and got fat and lazy. It gave the American people a "do-nothing" government for which they suffered through the terrible days. That was one reason why in 1932 they turned to the Democratic Party. And the other reason was that the Democratic Party, during that summer and autumn, had a program of action and sounded sincere. (Applause)

Four years went by and in the election of 1936 the Republican



Party looked to the country and indeed to all the world like (a) one of those old straddle-bugs I used to see on the pond at Hyde Park. The Democratic Party, however, was carrying out its pledges of 1932 and was still fighting. Hence the overwhelming victory of 1936.

Millions -- millions who had never been Democrats gave us the power in 1932, and again in (1936) '36, to get certain things done. And our party can continue in power only so long as it can, as a party, get (done) those things done which non-Democrats, as well as Democrats, put it in power to do. (Applause)

I have been looking back through some of the history books.

In 1834, 104 years ago, when Jackson was President, a shrewd observer wrote a letter (which) that I think we ought to read and take to heart today. He said in it:

"There are two parties here -- one which would do anything to put (down) Jackson down, and the other anything to sustain him. But there is a third party -- and a very large one -- which cares not a straw about who is President but (who) which anxiously desire to see some measure of relief for the country, let it operate against or in favor of whom it may."

Today, as in Jackson's day, a majority of the people want only a President who honestly cares for them and a party anxiously and unitedly seeking a way to serve them without regard to personal or political fortunes.

Less than half (of) the voters of America are Democrats. Less than half the voters of this nation are Republicans. But more than half of the voters are for the Democratic Party whenever the Democratic Party is for the majority of the people. (Applause)

And I welcome the return of the Republican Party to a position where it can no longer excuse itself for not having a program on

the ground that it has too few votes.

During recent years, Republican impotence has caused powerful interests, opposed to genuine democracy, to push their way into the Democratic Party, hoping to paralyze it by dividing its councils.

The first effect of the gains made by the Republican Party (in the recent elections) should be to restore to it the open allegiance of those who entered our primaries and party councils with deliberate intent to destroy our party's unity and effectiveness.

And the second effect of these gains should be to bring us real Democrats together and to line up with us those from other parties, those who belong to no party at all, who also preach the liberal gospel, so that, firmly allied, we may continue a common constructive service to the people of the (country) land.

For if these independent voters have the conviction that the Democratic Party will remain a liberal party, they will be the first to perceive what I here and now prophesy: that the Republican leadership, conservative at heart, will still seek to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, talking (for) of balanced budgets out of one side of its mouth and (for) in favor of opportunist raids on the Treasury out of the other. (Applause)

Yes, opportunists they have been -- opportunists they still are: see how they have tried to shuffle New Deal cards.

The Republican first New Deal joyfully went along with our New Deal -- in other words, while we were getting them off the spot and keeping them out of bankruptcy -- (or) and worse.

The Republican second New Deal a few years ago said to its members, "Support New Deal objectives but oppose legislation to put

them into effect."

And the Republican third New Deal -- 1938 model -- issued this order: "Get for the voters of your district all the New Deal benefits, promise them bigger and better benefits -- any old kind of benefits that any old group asks for -- but never mention how those benefits will be paid for." (Applause)

And it seems to me that those tactics, those tactics are wrong even for a party out of power, and if continued for another two years, they can hardly give (our) to the voters of the Nation any real confidence in the Republican Party or its leadership.

We Democrats, however, have to act as a party in power. And we cannot hold the confidence of the people if we cannot avoid wrangling except by agreeing to sit still and do nothing.

If there are nominal Democrats who as a matter of principle are convinced that our party should be a conservative party -- a Democratic Tweedledum to a Republican Tweedledee -- it is on the whole better that the issue be drawn within the party, that the fight be fought out, and that if the Tweedledums are defeated they join the Tweedledees. (Applause) But, my friends, the prospects of such a dragdown and knockout fight are far more remote than members of the opposition would have you believe. The people of the country are not deceived when honest debate and an honest effort to work things out for the good of the country are labeled dissension (and) or called bad blood by those outside of the party whose wish is father to the thought. (They) Those people hate to admit it but the fact remains that such open debate on our part, such open debate over the period of the past six years has borne six crops of good fruit.

If we deliver in full on our contract to the American people we need never fear the Republican Party so long as it commands the support of -- in fact (is) down underneath is actually directed by -- the same people who have owned it for several generations. For the American Liberty League -- unless I am incorrectly informed -- still functions as a vehicle for political contributions and the spreading of shopworn propaganda.

Jackson and the party as he led it, they delivered on the barrel-head.

Up to the very last (he) Jackson delivered for the common people he believed in, and for the national unity (which) he did so much to create.

On his very last day in the White House he vetoed a bill, a bill supported by the opposition and many of his own party -- a bill which surrendered to the states and to a thousand, warring, petty local interests, the Federal Government's responsibility for husbanding the surplus funds in the Federal Treasury for the benefit of the whole Nation.

And, along side this statement in my manuscript I note the letters N. B. -- which in dead Latin stand for "nota bene," or in live English, "take good notice."

Jackson's successor, reputedly a smart politician, could not keep the Democratic Party in power because he and they drifted from principles to politics. He and they were turned out at the next national election in 1840, because they failed to keep the pork barrel locked up in the cellar and because they failed to deliver what they had promised to anyone except themselves.



And again my manuscript bids me say "N. B. -- take good notice." (Laughter)

Let this be another thought for 1940. In 1840 the new Whig President, William Henry Harrison, elected on a red fire -- note the color -- hard cider, sky-is-the-limit campaign, backed by the descendants of Hamiltonian aristocrats and by disgruntled Democrats, made his first tender of the Secretaryship of the Treasury in his Cabinet -- to whom do you suppose? To (old) none other than old Nicholas Biddle himself, Nicholas Biddle, the money changer whom Andrew Jackson had so soundly trounced and driven from the Temple.

From Andrew Jackson to Nicholas Biddle -- four short years. And again I say to you of the country, "N. B. -- take good notice." (Laughter -- applause)

A full generation -- twenty years -- passed by, passed by before the principle of Andrew Jackson's true democracy came back to life in the White House with the next real Democrat, Abraham Lincoln. (Applause) And, parenthetically, he (incidentally) was chosen President only by the founding of a new party.

Let me ask two obvious questions. Does anyone maintain -- this is a day and an age in which we do not gloss things over -- does anyone maintain that the Democratic Party from 1840 to 1876 was by any wild stretch of the imagination the party of Thomas Jefferson or of Andrew Jackson? To claim that is absurd.

Does anyone maintain that the Republican Party from 1868 to 1936 (with the possible exception of a few years under Theodore Roosevelt) was the party of Abraham Lincoln? To claim that is equally absurd. (Applause)

My casual acquaintance -- shall I say my casual acquaintance -- with political life (laughter) for twenty-five years, (and a) my more serious reading of prior history, leads me to observe that the American people have greatly changed in their attitude towards government in this -- our -- generation.

We of this modern day take our politics less seriously. And we take our government more seriously.

In the old days the ideal candidate, whom smart managers always looked for, was, as someone has described a former President, a man with "a protective reputation, an obvious but unalert integrity .... a complete absence of plan or even of thought." It might be well for both parties in considering their candidates for President and Vice President to apply that formula, or to be more strictly accurate, the reverse of that formula -- to apply it to the dozens -- I think there are dozens -- who, like Barkis, seem even at this moment, seem to be very, very willing.

In the old days, for the bulk of the population, the elections were only a seasonal diversion -- a circus with an oratorical sideshow -- with the real job done by quiet economic and social -- perhaps I should say back room -- pressures behind the scenes.

Today there is emerging a real and forceful belief on the part of the great mass of the people that honest, intelligent and courageous government can solve many problems which the average individual cannot face alone in a world where there are no longer (one) a hundred and twenty acres of good land free for everybody.

Today the voting public watches and analyzes every move made by those who govern them -- whether in the Executive or in the Legis-

lative or in the Judicial branches of (the) our Government -- analyzes them with clearer perception and greater insistence on efficiency and honesty.

Today in that analyzing they are less and less influenced by the red fire and the hard cider bellyhoo of newspaper owners or political orators who adhere to the practices of a century ago.

Yes, we, we of our generation, have learned to go behind the headlines and behind the leads and behind the glittering generalities in order to analyze and reanalyze, using, thank God, our own thinking processes and not somebody else's (to) before we make up our own minds.  
(Applause)

You remember -- you remember what Abraham Lincoln said about fooling the people. That was in the 1860's. I should say that no wise political leader (in) of 1939 will take it as a safe working rule that you can fool many of the people any of the time.

This new generation, since the war, believes more than did its fathers in the precept "I am my brother's keeper." It believes in realities, economic and spiritual realities, where its fathers did not bother much to go beneath catchwords.

And it is a nation that is national in its outlook. Youth today will not listen to a sectional conception of party politics -- to a combination of two or three parts of the country against another part, or farmers against labor or business against the state.

The younger generation of Americans, by a very large majority, intend to keep on "going places" with the New Deal. (Applause)  
(Do not) And let us not overlook this rising generation. Its vote rises proportionately (every) each year.

On Jackson Day every true follower of Jackson asks that the Democratic Party continue to make democracy work.

In answer to the demands of the American people we have expanded the functions of the Government of the United States. We are handling complicated problems of administration with which no other party has ever had to wrestle. To do that, we are constantly recruiting lieutenants who will give intense and genuine devotion to the cause of liberal (governing) government. We have brought to the Government men and women whose first thought is to be of service, of service to their country through their government -- men and women with fewer attributes of selfishness and more objectives of clean service than any group I have ever come in contact with in a somewhat long career.

(Applause)

Almost without exception they are more intent on doing a good job than in keeping themselves on the payrolls. Almost without exception they possess that quality of cooperative effort (which) that distinguishes them from the oldtime political office-holder of half a century ago.

We seek and we welcome their cooperation and yours, not only from those who are with us now but from others who come to see the light. We are even willing to accept temporary help.

But we always bear in mind the story of the Orangemen's parade in North Ireland on the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne.

The parade was set but the Orangemen had no bass drum. And what is a parade without a bass drum!

(But) So the captain of the Orangemen (had) happened to have as a good personal friend (in) the captain of the Fenians in the same



town.

(So) He explained his problem to his friend, the captain of the Fenians, and asked him to cooperate by lending the Fenian drum for the Orangemen's parade.

"Sure," said the captain of the Fenians, "I'll give you my fullest cooperation. I will lend you the drum; you couldn't have a decent parade without it."

"But," he added, with a twinkle in his eye, "since I'm personally responsible for the safety of the drum you'll understand if I have to make one personal condition. You'll have to agree to take the drum out of the parade when you get to Queen Street.

"For that -- that's the corner where we Fenians are going to be laying for you." (Laughter -- applause)

And, if we -- if we Democrats lay for each other now, we can be sure that 1940 (is) will be the corner where the American people will be laying for all of us. (Applause)

The way to avoid fighting among ourselves is to fight together against the enemies of the American people -- inertia, greed, ignorance, shortsightedness, vanity, opportunism -- all of the evils that turn man against man.

It is my belief, and it is the belief of the great majority of those who hear me tonight, that not just for two years to come, but for a generation to come, we will maintain a united front against those enemies of America. (Applause)

And let us -- let us remember the example of Andrew Jackson, who fought to the last for a united democratic nation.

If we do that -- by the Eternal, we shall never have to strike our (colors) flag. (Prolonged, rising applause)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT

Delivered at the Capitol before a Joint Session of the Congress  
On the occasion of the 150th Anniversary of Congress  
March 4, 1939, 12.30 P. M., E. S. T.

MR. VICE PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, GENTLEMEN OF THE SUPREME COURT, MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, GENTLEMEN OF THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS:

We near the end of a three year commemoration of the founding of the government of the United States. It has been aptly suggested that its successful organizing should rank as the eighth wonder of the world -- for surely the evolution of permanent substance out of nebulous chaos justifies us in the use of superlatives.

Thus, we may increase our oratory and please our vanity by picturing the period of the War of the Revolution as crowded with a unanimous population of heroes dramatized by the admitted existence of a handful of traitors to fill the necessary role of villain. Nevertheless, we are aware today that a more serious reading of history depicts a far less pleasing scene.

It should not detract from our satisfaction in the result to acknowledge that a very large number of the inhabitants of the thirteen revolting colonies were opposed to rebellion, and opposed to independence; that there was constant friction between the Continental Congress and the Commander-in-Chief and his Generals in the field; that inefficiency, regardless of the cause of it, was the rule

rather than the exception in the long (drawn out) eight years of the war; and finally that there is grave doubt as to whether independence would have been won at all if Great Britain herself had not been confronted with wars in Europe which diverted her attention to the maintenance of her own existence in the nearer arena.

We can at least give thanks that (in) the first chapter -- the Revolution -- that in that chapter all was well that ended well; and we can at least give thanks to those outstanding figures who strove against great odds for the maintenance of the national ideal which their vision and courage had created.

The opening of the new chapter in 1783 discloses very definitely that assurance of continued independence could be guaranteed by none. Dissension and discord were so widely distributed among the thirteen new states that it was impossible to set up a union more strong or permanent than that loose-end, shaky, debating society provided for under the Articles of Confederation. That we survived for six years is more a tribute to the ability of the Confederation Congress gracefully to do nothing and to the exhaustion of the Nation that followed the (end of the) War, rather than to any outstanding statesmanship or even leadership during the first of those years. So, again, speaking truthfully and frankly, we can properly say of the period of Confederation, that all was well that ended well.

Those years have rightly been called "the critical period of American history." But for crisis - in this case a crisis of peace - there would have been no Union: you the members of the Senate and (the) House; you the Chief Justice, (and) the Associate Justices and I, the President of the United States, we would not be here on this Fourth of March, a century and a half later.

It is well to remember that from 1781 to 1789 the thirteen original States existed as a nation by the single thread of Congressional government, and without (an Executive or a Judicial branch) the Judicial or an Executive branch. This annual assembly of representatives, moreover, was compelled to act not by a majority but by States, and in the more important functions by the requirement that nine States out of the thirteen must consent to the action.

In actual authority the Congresses of the Confederation were principally limited to the fields of external relations and the national defense. The fatal defect was of course the lack of power to raise revenue for the maintenance of the system; and our ancestors, our predecessors, may be called at the least optimistic if they believed that thirteen sovereign Republics would promptly pay over to the Confederation, voluntarily, even the small sums (which) that were assessed against them for the annual maintenance of the Congress and its functions.

Furthermore, the effect of the existing methods



of transportation and communication retarded the development of a truly national government far more greatly than we realize today -- and that was true throughout the first half century of our union. You have heard the phrase the "horse and buggy age." We use it not in derogation of the men who had to spend weeks on the rough highways before they could establish a quorum of the Congress, not in implication of inferiority on the part of those who perforce could not visit their neighbors in other states and visualize at first hand the problems of the whole of an infant nation.

We use it rather to explain the tedious delays, (and) the local antagonisms and jealousies which beset our early paths. (and) We use it perhaps to remind our citizens of today (that) the automobile, the railroad, the airplane, the electrical impulse over the wire and through the ether leave to no citizen of the United States an excuse for sectionalism, for delay in the execution of the public business or for a failure to maintain a full understanding of the acceleration of the processes of civilization. (Applause)

Thus the crisis which faced the new nation through its lack of national powers was recognized as early as 1783, but the very slowness of contacts prevented a sufficient general perception of the danger until 1787 when the Congress of the Confederation issued a call for the holding of a Constitutional Convention (in) that May.

We are familiar with the immortal document which

issued from that convention; of the ratification of it by sufficient states to give it effect; of the action of the Confederation Congress which terminated its own existence in calling on the first Federal Congress to assemble on March 4th, 1789.

We know of the month's delay before a quorum could be attained; of the counting of the ballots unanimously cast for General Washington; of his notification; of his triumphal journey from Mount Vernon to New York; and of his inauguration as first President on April 30th.

So ended the crisis. So, from a society of thirteen republics was born a nation with the attributes of nationality and the framework of permanence.

I believe that it has been held by the Supreme Court that the authority of the Articles of Confederation ended on March 3, 1789. Therefore, the Constitution went into effect the next day.

That Constitution was based on the theory of representative government, two of the three branches of its government being chosen by the people, directly in the case of the House of Representatives, by elected Legislatures in the case of the (Senators) Senate, and by elected electors in the case of the President and the Vice President. It is true that in many States the franchise was greatly limited, yet the cardinal principle of free choice by the body politic prevailed. I emphasize the words "free choice" because until

a very few years ago this fundamental, or perhaps in more modern language I should call it this ideology of democracy, until a few years ago was in the ascendant throughout the world, and nation after nation was broadening its practice of what the American Constitution had established here so firmly and so well.

The safety of the system of representative (democracy) government is in the last analysis based on two essentials: First, that at frequent periods the voters must choose a new Congress and a new President; and second, that this choice must be made freely, that is to say without any undue force against or influence over the voter in the expression of his personal and sincere opinion.

That after all is the greatest difference between what we know as democracy, and those other forms of government which, though they seem new to us, are essentially old -- for they revert to those systems of concentrated self-perpetuating power against which the representatives of the democratic system (was) were successfully (launched several) striving many centuries ago.

Today, with many other democracies, the United States will give no encouragement to the belief that our processes are outworn, or that we will approvingly watch the return of forms of government which for two thousand years have proved their tyranny and their instability alike.  
(Applause)

Yes, with the direct control of the free choosing of public servants by a free electorate, (the) our Constitution has proved that (this) our type of government cannot long remain in the hands of (those) any who seek personal aggrandisement for selfish ends, whether they act as individuals, as classes, or as groups.

It is therefore in the spirit of our system that our elections are positive in their mandate, rather than passive in their acquiescence. Many other nations envy us the enthusiasm, the attacks, the wild over-statements, the falsehood gaily intermingled (gaily) with the truth that marks our general elections. Yes, they envy us because (they) all of these things are promptly followed by acquiescence in the result and (a) the return to calmer waters as soon as the ballots are counted.

We celebrate today the completion of the building of the constitutional house. But one essential was lacking -- for the structure called the house had to be made habitable. And even in the period of the building, those who put stone upon stone, those who voted to accept (it) the structure from the hands of the builders knew that life within the house needed other things for its inhabitants. Without those things, indeed, they could never be secure in their tenure, happy in their toil (and) or in their rest.

And so there came about that tacit understanding that to the Constitution would be added a Bill of Rights.



Well and truly did the first Congress of the United States fulfill that first unwritten pledge; and the personal guarantees thus given to our individual citizens have established, we trust for all time, what has become as ingrained in our American natures as the free elective choice of our representatives itself.

In that Bill of Rights lies another vast chasm between our representative democracy and those reversion to personal rule which have characterized these (recent) later years.

Jury trial -- do the people of our own land ever stop to compare (that) the blessed right of ours with some processes of trial and punishment which of late have re-incarnated the so-called "justice" of the dark ages?

The taking of private property without due compensation -- would we willingly abandon our security against that in the face of the events of recent years?

The right to be safe against unwarrantable searches and seizures -- read your newspapers and rejoice that our firesides and our households are still safe. (Applause)

Freedom to assemble and petition the Congress for a redress of grievances -- why, the mail and the telegraph bring daily proof to every Senator and every Representative that that right is at the height of (an) unrestrained popularity. (Applause -- laughter)

Freedom of speech -- yes, that too is unchecked

(laughter -- applause) for never in all history has there been so much of it on every side of every subject. It is indeed a freedom which because of the mildness of our laws of libel and slander, goes unchecked except by the good sense of the American people. Any person -- any person is constitutionally entitled to criticize and call to account the highest and the lowest in the land -- save only in one exception. For be it noted that the Constitution of the United States itself protects Senators and Representatives and provides that "for any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place." (Applause drowned out the last few words) And I know also that that immunity is most carefully not extended (to) either to the Chief Justice of the United States or the President. (Laughter)

Freedom of the press -- I take it that no sensible man or woman believes that it has been curtailed or threatened or that it should be. The influence of the printed word will always depend on its veracity, and the nation can safely rely on the wise discrimination of a reading public which with the increase in the general education is well able to sort truth from fiction. Representative democracy will never tolerate suppression of true news at the behest of government. (Applause)

Freedom of religion -- that essential of the rights of mankind everywhere goes back also to the origins of repre-

sentative government. Where democracy is snuffed out, where it is curtailed, there, too, the right to worship God in one's own way is circumscribed or abrogated. Shall we by our passiveness, by our silence, by assuming the attitude of the Levite who pulled his skirts together and passed by on the other side, shall we thus lend encouragement to those who today persecute religion or deny it?

The answer to that is "no" today, just as in the days of the first Congress of the United States it was also "no". (Applause)

Not for freedom of religion alone does this nation contend by every peaceful means. We believe in the other freedoms of the Bill of Rights, the other freedoms that are inherent in the right of free choice by free men and women. That means democracy to us under the Constitution, not democracy by direct action of the mob; but democracy exercised by representatives chosen by the people themselves.

Here, in this great hall, are assembled the present members of the government of the United States (of America) -- the Congress, the Supreme Court and the Executive. Our fathers rightly believed that this government which they set up would seek as a whole to act as a whole for the good governing of the nation. It is in the same spirit that we are met here, today, 150 years later, set to carry on their task. May God continue to guide our steps. (Prolonged applause)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
Delivered before the Retailers' National Forum  
of the American Retail Federation  
Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.  
May 22, 1939, 9.30 P.M.

(The President was introduced by Mr. Louis E. Kirstein,  
president of the American Retail Federation.)

MR. KIRSTEIN, DR. CRAIG, MY FELLOW RETAILERS: (Applause)

I am happy to speak at this first Forum (of) for the American Retail Federation. I feel a kinship between your business and mine. (Laughter) The backbone of the customers we are both trying to satisfy is the same -- (laughter-applause) in your case the many small customers whose steady demand for the necessities and a few luxuries of life make up your volume -- in my case millions of average American families whose standard of living is the practical measure of the success of our democracy. You have one advantage over me, however: unlike Louis Kirstein, for instance, I have no bargain basement. (Laughter-applause)

I hope tonight that you are all cash customers. (Laughter)  
With one exception, after carefully searching the room, I certify that you are all retailers. That one exception is Henry Morgenthau, Jr. and he is a wholesaler.

For you who are in the honorable business of storekeeping, the flow of consumer purchasing power determines the difference between red and black on your account books; and for the Nation the difference between unemployment and prosperity.

That is why I want to devote this opportunity to a discussion of -- a difficult and probably exceedingly dangerous discussion of Government fiscal policy in relation to consumer pur-



chasing power.

There are some highbrow columnists and some high-g geared economists, who say (that you and I think) to you that we think, you and I, too much about consumers' purchasing power and that we look at our economic problems from the wrong end. They say that we should glue all of our attention (on) to the heavy industries, and should do everything and anything just to get (these) those industries to work and to get private investors to put up the money to build new buildings and new machines without regard to the average consumer's need or his ability to use (these) the buildings (or) and the machines after they are erected.

By and large, you will find that these experts are the same individuals as those who (in 1929) just ten years ago were telling (told) us that conditions were sound and that we had found the way to end poverty. In those days, when we were building luxurious office buildings and hotels and apartment houses (which consumers did not need and had not the purchasing power to pay for) and four-tracking the railroads -- doing all this, all this work for consumers who did not need it as much as those experts thought, consumers who did not have the purchasing power to pay for them.

Today in 1939 they tell you that conditions are not sound because we are trying to build the sort of houses and other things (which) that our people really need, and because we are trying to make sure that our people have the purchasing power to pay for these things when they are built.

They (were) are unrealistic, these people, and theoretical.  
They were that when they were prophesying their new era in 1929 --

and they are just as unrealistic and theoretical and wrong -- when they are prophesying national bankruptcy in 1939.

To translate (this) that into terms of (the retail) trade, the shelves of heavy industries and the shelves of consumers in 1929 were seriously overstacked. We did not think so then, perhaps, but we know it now. You know what happens to (storekeepers) merchants of all kinds if they buy twice as much as the public can buy from them.

In the last analysis, therefore, consumer buying power is the milk in the coconut of all business.

Whether you are a big department store or do business in a small way on the Main Street of a small town, your sales are dependent on how much money the average family in the community (earns) is earning. Yes, that is a homely way of putting it, but it seems to me that it is an eternal truth.

And that is one reason, my friends, why I have talked so much about the one-third of our population that is ill-clad and ill-housed and ill-fed. That third -- forty million (people) Americans -- can buy very little at the stores and, therefore, I do not have to tell you that their local stores can order very little at the factories. Some of my friends laugh at me when I stress (this) that, laugh at efforts, for example, to establish minimum wages and to get more purchasing power for the lowest groups. But the little and the big storekeepers understand and know they will sell more goods if their customers have more money. I want, and I think I have, your help, to build up the purchasing power of the average of your customers and mine.

How shall we produce more customers with more money in their pockets?

One school of thought that we hear about is what I call the school of the gamblers. Yes, you find some of them in every community -- as well as in Wall Street, and some of them, of the political variety, even in the halls of the Congress itself (and State Legislatures). (Applause)

That school, that school of the gamblers is eager to gamble the safety of the Nation, (and) the safety of our system of private enterprise on nothing more than their personal hunch that if Government will just keep its hands off the economic system, customers will just happen. I use the word "gamble" because there is no modern experience to support their theory.

In fact, modern experience denies their theory. Between 1925, let us say, and 1933 -- that is, March 4, 1933 (laughter) -- the Government in this country of ours abandoned practically all concern for business and put into effect a tax system in those years, a tax system such as "Old Dealers" dream about. Customers and the buying power of customers were (left) just left to happen. And you and I know how many and how much happened.

These people who are playing the "it may happen" hunch today are actually the wildest eyed radicals in our midst, because despite proved failures they want to gamble on their own hunch once more.

And in the other school (of thought) we are the conservative New Dealers. (Applause) And here is the proof: We are the conservatives because we simply cannot bring ourselves to take radical chances with other people's property and other people's lives.

Now the owner of a private business may have the legal right to take a long chance, a chance that may make or break his personal fortune. If he alone goes out of business, the economic system is not endangered.

But the people who run the three branches of our Government do not have the moral right to gamble with the well-being of (one) a hundred and twenty million Americans. If millions of citizens starve, it is no answer to the starving to say that in the sweet by-and-by business, left to itself, will give them a job. Partisans are going around the country scaring parents, parents who are not starving, by telling (them) those parents of an increased national debt which their grandchildren will have to pay. Certainly that is not as alarming as telling parents who are already starving that an untrammelled business setup will provide their grandchildren with food in 1989. And yet that is what the radical gamblers of business and politics might have to say if they were to put their theories into practice (next year) in 1941.

Not one of you who are good Americans and practical Americans believe that we could repeat the catastrophe of those years immediately preceding and following 1929 and emerge from it with our economic and social system unchanged. No business man, big or little, can fairly or patriotically ask his Government to take a course of action that runs that risk.

And that is why our school of thought -- the conservative school -- holds the view that an intelligent nation should rest its faith in arithmetic rather than in a hunch.

Today, in order to provide customers for business, your



Government uses Government capital to provide jobs, to prevent farm prices from collapsing and to build up purchasing power when private capital fails to do it. For example, out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government to provide jobs, more than fifty cents passes over the counters of the retail merchants of America.

We also use what we call social legislation -- such as legislation to encourage better pay for low-paid labor and thereby provide more and better customers for you; such as legislation to protect investors so that they may continue to be your customers without losing their savings in worthless stocks and bonds.

I wonder if you have any conception of the number of businessmen and bankers and economists whom I talk with briefly or at length in any given month of the year. I wonder if you have any conception of the variety of suggestions and panaceas that they offer to me. I wonder if you know the very large percentage of them who honestly and in good faith and very naturally think of national problems solely in terms of their own business. I wonder if you will be surprised if I tell you that most of them leave my office saying to me -- "Why, Mr. President, I did not know about that. You have given me a new perspective. You have told me new things that are happening, new causes, new effects. I never thought of the problem in that way before."

I sit in my office with a business man who thinks the surest way to produce customers is to balance the Federal budget now, this year (at once). And I say to him - "How?"

Sometimes he says -- "How should I know? That is your job." Sometimes he says -- "Cut the budget, cut it straight through 10% or 20%."

And then I take from my desk drawer a fat book and it is apparent at once from his expression that he has never seen or read the budget of the Government of the United States.

He tries to change the subject but I hold him to it. I say - "This budget is not all of one piece; it is an aggregate of (hundreds) thousands of items. (Either we will) I will, therefore, have to cut every item/<sup>the</sup>10% or 20% you ask or, if we do not do this, I will have to cut some items very much more than 10% or 20%."

I point out the one and a half billion dollars for the Army and Navy. He pounds the desk and says in patriotic fervor -- "Don't cut that item -- not in these days."

I show him the item of a billion dollars for interest on the public debt. He owns some Government bonds and he rejects any cut in his interest.

I show him the billion dollar item for war and civil service pensions. And he says -- "No -- (no cut there) we couldn't get enough popular support to cut this."

I mention the billion dollars for running the permanent functions of the regular Government departments -- and I tell him that they cost less today for those functions than under my predecessor. And he readily agrees that the postman and the G-man and the forest service and the custom people cannot be curtailed. The only people he would sever from the payrolls are the tax collectors.  
(Laughter)

Well, that gets us down to a few other big items -- totaling over four billion dollars to take care of four major things -- payments to agriculture for the benefit of agriculture, Federal public

works, including P. W. A. and reclamation and flood control, work relief for the unemployed, including the C. C. C. Camps, and assistance for our old people.

My visitor agrees with me that we are going through a transitional period seeking the best way to maintain decent prices for the farm population of America, trying to make them better customers of business men -- and that even if we have not yet (found) attained the permanent solution we have got away permanently from 5¢ cotton and 10¢ corn and 30¢ wheat.

I come to the public works item. He suggests that that can be cut 50%. I happen to know that his community is working tooth and nail to get a grant for a much needed new high school (or) and that his county suffered severe property losses from recent floods. And I suggest that we will start public works economy right there and not give the grants, and that we will defer building the school-houses or the levee or the flood control dam for twenty or thirty years.

And in every case I find what I suspected. His local Chamber of Commerce, his local newspapers are yelling their heads off to have those projects built with Federal assistance. (Applause) And I say to him - "Consistency, thy name is geography. (Applause) Why, I think you believe with the United States Chamber of Commerce that Federal spending on public works should cease -- except in your own home town." (Laughter-applause)

And then we come to the item of funds for work relief: there my visitor-customer makes a last stand. He wants that cut, and cut hard.

We agree that there are between three and four million American workers, who, with their families, need work (or money) to keep alive. I drive him to the inevitable admission that the only alternative to work is to put them on a dole.

And that is where I make a stand.

I tell my visitor that never so long as I am President of the United States will I condemn millions of men and women to the dry-rot of idleness on (a) the dole; never condemn the business enterprise of the United States to the loss of millions of dollars worth of customer purchasing power; never take the terrific risk of what would happen to the social and economic and political system of American democracy if we foisted on it an occasional market basket of groceries instead of the chance to work. (Applause-prolonged)

Yes, I well know the difficulties and the costs of (a) work relief (policy).

I do not have to be told by any Congressional Committee or any United States Chamber of Commerce that 5% of the projects are of questionable value -- I know it. Or that 5% of the people on relief projects ought not to be on the rolls -- I know that too, and so do you. But when you think of nearly three million men and women scattered over all of the forty-eight states, including the four that are not here, and all of the thirty-one hundred and some odd counties in America, I am proud of the fact that 95% of the projects are good, and that 95% of the people are properly on the rolls. And I know that the American people cannot be fooled into believing that the few exceptions actually constitute the general practice. (Applause)

And, finally, my friend across the desk murmurs something



about old age pensions. He is a bit half-hearted about this and he finally admits not only the need for dignified support of old age, given and accepted as a new American right, for all time to come from now on, but he realizes that over a period of years this support will have to be extended rather than reduced. You and I and all Americans agree that we must work out this problem for (our) the old people of our Nation.

And so, at the end, my visitor leaves convinced, in nine cases out of ten, that I am not a complete and utter fool and that balancing the budget today, or even next year, is a pretty difficult if not an impossible job.

And now we come to the other side of the budget, the receipts:

A few words about Federal taxes:

Federal taxes. I have discovered after about a quarter of a century in public life of one kind or another interspersed with various forays into business and the law -- I have discovered that taxes (they) fall into three principal categories -- consumer taxes like the taxes on cigarettes and gasoline and liquor; personal taxes, like the personal income taxes and the inheritance taxes; and, finally, taxes on corporations. Together, (they) these taxes yield (nearly) to the Federal Government about six billion dollars.

For good sound business reasons two things seem pretty clear to me.

First, especially in view of the unbalanced budget, and in order to bring it more rapidly into balance, we ought not to raise less money from taxation than we are doing now.

You have with you a very delightful gentleman, a great merchant of London, Mr. Selfridge. I hope very much that you will put him into a corner and ask him about the taxes that he pays without a murmur to keep England afloat. (Applause)

And, secondly, I think it would be bad for business, for business itself, to shift any further burden to consumer taxes. The proportion of consumer taxes to the total is plenty high enough (as it is) now. Remember, as business men and as retailers, that any further taxes on consumers, like a sales tax, means that the consumers can buy fewer goods at your store. (Applause)

Therefore, I want to leave the proportion between these three groups of taxes (just where it is now) about where they are today.

That means that if we reduce so-called deterrent taxes on business corporations, we must find substitute taxes to lay on business corporations. That language, that sort, is as plain as an old shoe. Let me give you an example of what I call making a mountain out of a mole hill. There is a great hullabaloo for the repeal of the undistributed earnings tax. You would think that this was the principal deterrent to business today. And yet it is a simple fact that out of one billion one hundred million dollars paid to the Federal Government by corporations, less than twenty million dollars comes to the Government from the undistributed earnings tax -- less than 2% of the total.

Let me proceed. I am wholly willing to have this twenty million dollar tax, which is less than 2% of the total, wholly repealed on two simple conditions, which are based not on whim, not

on hunch, but on principle.

The first is that this twenty million dollars shall be raised by some other form of tax against corporations and not against other groups of taxpayers -- and that it shall be raised in such a way that it will be paid by the twenty-eight thousand bigger corporations, earning more than \$25,000. a year, and not by the one hundred and seventy-five thousand little corporations that earn(ing) less than that sum. (Applause)

And the second condition is that in the repeal of this tax we shall not return to the old tax evasion loophole by which a very small group of (very rich) people with incomes in the very high brackets (were) used to be able, until two years ago, to leave their profits in closely held corporations, thus avoiding the full rates of the higher brackets on their personal incomes. It seems to me that patriotic people everywhere will not want to go back to that old pernicious habit.

I have talked with you at some length about the radicals who have the hunch that we ought to go back to the conditions of 1929; about performing a major operation by amputating present functions of government; and about the efforts of some who would reduce corporation taxes and add to consumer taxes.

But I would not have you believe that the conservative attitude of this Administration plans as any permanent part of our American system an indefinite continuation of excess of out-go over cash receipts.

This week, I understand, is dedicated by the opponents of the Administration to merchandising horror about the national debt.

(Laughter) We are having a National Debt Week like a National Clean-Up and a National Paint-Up Week. (Laughter)

Right; let us talk about the debt in business men's terms.

In the first place, a nation's debt, like the deposit liability of a bank, must be considered in relation to its assets.

A large part of the Government debt is offset by debts owed to the Government -- loans of many kinds made on a business basis by the R. F. C. and the Farm Credit Administration, for (instance, and) example, loans that are now being repaid on schedule. (These) Those assets are just as sound as the loans made by the bankers of the country.

Another portion of the national debt is invested in Federally-owned enterprises, like Boulder Dam, which is finished, and Bonneville Dam, which is finished, and Grand Coulee Dam, a great irrigation project where we hope to put the Dust Bowl farmers, which will be finished in another year or so, projects which are paying out and will pay out, principal and interest, over a period of years.

A third part of the debt has been invested in works like flood control dams and levees, to save us from heavy future losses. They will pay for themselves in a very few years by eliminating annual property damage which each year has run literally into hundreds of millions of dollars -- pay by the saving of taxable values which otherwise would have floated off down stream.

The next thing to remember about the debt is that Government, like businessmen, is investing in order to create a higher volume of business income and, therefore, a bigger net yield for Government and for business. National income will be greater tomorrow than it is



today because Government has had the courage to borrow idle capital and put it and idle labor to work.

The year before I took office, 1932, our national income was thirty-nine billions. In 1937 it got up to sixty-nine billions. In 1938 it went back almost to sixty-two billions. And today it is running at the rate of better than sixty-five billions. At eighty billions -- and this is an eighty-billion-dollar country -- the income from present taxes will be more than sufficient to meet expenditures on the present scale -- and actually (to reduce our relief appropriations) when that time comes, the expenditures will be less because our relief bill will be lowered.

Today with no danger of surplus of goods overhanging the market -- just because we have tried to keep consumer purchasing power up to production -- the Nation is in an excellent position to move forward into a period of greater production and greater employment. That is my sincere belief and I believe that it is your belief too. (Applause)

(And) So, when, (this week) at the end of this famous week we are getting into, you see all the crocodile tears about the burden on our grandchildren to pay the Government debt, remember this:

Our national debt after all is an internal debt owed not (only) by the Nation but to the Nation. If our children have to pay interest on it they will pay that interest (to) themselves to themselves. A reasonable internal debt (will not) is not going to im- poverish our children or put the Nation into bankruptcy.

But if we do not allow a democratic Government to do the things (which) that need to be done and hand down to our children a

deteriorated nation, their legacy will be not a legacy of abundance or even a legacy of poverty (amidst) amid plenty, but a legacy of poverty (amidst) amid poverty.

Don't you agree that it is better to work unitedly to balance national income and national out-go at a level where Government can do the things that have to be done to preserve our people and our resources than to play the speculative hunch and withdraw Government from lending and investment, from conserving property and from providing work for our capital and our people, in the hope that in some mysterious way a miracle will occur -- a miracle which our only experience under modern conditions (have) has proved impossible?

I keep saying "Do not lose sight of the forest because of the trees." Let us always distinguish principles and objectives from details and mechanics. You cannot expect this Administration to alter the principles and objectives for which we have struggled (the last six years) for more than six years.

But if you approve of the purposes that lie behind our policies, but believe our operating methods can be improved, then your help and your counsel are welcome -- doubly welcome in this Administration. (Applause) That relates to the details of taxation, the details of relief, the details of every administrative branch (of the government) in Washington and in every state.

If I have spoken to you seriously tonight, it is because I believe that you, you too, are thinking of the well-being of every man, woman and child in our country-- that you go along with me in every effort that I can make for the preservation of world peace and for the preservation of domestic peace -- (applause) not merely an

armed peace (which) that foregoes war for the moment, but a peace that comes from a knowledge, both at home and abroad (and at home), that there will be no further acts of aggression on the part of nations, on the part of groups or on the part of individuals. You think, rightly, of profits in your own business -- so does every other American -- and so do I. But we are not ruled by the thought of profits alone. More and more we seek the making of profits by processes that will not destroy our fellow men, our fellow men who are our neighbors.

That is one of the functions of your Government. It seeks your cooperation in the extension of that ideal. It is open to your advice and your help -- because it believes that its fundamental <sup>are</sup> ideals and yours/just the same.

That is why I came to you not in the spirit of criticism, not (with) wielding a big stick, but coming with a simple plea for your assistance as American citizens in working out our common problems with good will and with the maintenance of the ideals of peace.  
(Applause-prolonged)



INFORMAL, EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT  
At the site of the Library-Museum  
Roosevelt Estate, Hyde Park, New York  
July 24, 1939, (about 12 o'clock noon, E. S. T.)

Today marks the first step, under the Act of Congress, of starting the building to hold certain historical collections, which I have made over a period of forty years, including my personal papers as State Senator, as Assistant Secretary of the Navy, as Governor of the State of New York and as President. The building is being erected under the supervision of the Archivist of the United States and a Committee of distinguished scholars, but it is being paid for solely and wholly by private subscription before it is turned over to the Government.

The new building will be at the west end of this big field, with a new driveway leading to it from the famous old New York to Albany Post Road, which is one of the most traveled through highways in the United States. The field is five miles from the City of Poughkeepsie, a city of 40,000 people, and about a mile and a half from Hyde Park Village.

The building itself will be constructed of Dutchess County weathered fieldstone, taken from old stone walls, and will be one and one-half stories in height.

When we go into the courtyard, which faces the highway, we will enter a hallway and proceed from it to an Exhibition Hall. It is the plan of the Trustees to place in this Hall various models, paintings and other



objects of interest which have been given to me or which I have acquired over a long period of years, also books on many subjects, many of them inscribed by their authors.

On the left of the main hall, a door leads into the Naval Collections Exhibition Room and here will be placed most of the United States Navy ship models, paintings, engravings, relics and books.

Continuing in this room we come to a small room that will be devoted to manuscripts and books and maps that relate to the early history of Dutchess County and the Hudson River Valley.

On the right will be the stackroom, a two-story permanent filing place for manuscripts and papers. To date there are more than six million of them, and one of the particular tasks of Dr. Connor, the Archivist, in the years to come will be to classify them, eliminate duplicates and keep them in constant repair.

Down in the basement will be several work shops and also a photograph room. Within the past few years a new device called a microfilm has been invented so that if any college or public library in any part of the country wants copies of any of the papers in this library, they can be photographed here on the microfilm with a saving of a great amount of space and sent out to the applying library.

It has been the conclusion of the committee of

scholars who have given me their advice on this whole project that in these modern days it is advisable for us not to put all of our historic eggs in one basket, that there is too much risk in having all of our historic material in one place. Therefore, they welcome a partial distribution of such original material through the different parts of the Nation. This spreads the risk and, incidentally will probably result in an increased public interest in historic documents in every part of the country.

In this field are several old oak trees of great antiquity. They are estimated to be three hundred years old, and that was sixty or seventy years before white settlers first came into this part of Dutchess County. It means also that these trees, spreading their great branches widely and close to the ground, grew up under field conditions and not as part of the original forest. We can, therefore, safely assume that this field was the site of an Indian village and that here they cultivated their corn. That is borne out, too, by the finding of many arrow heads and other relics of the original Indians who inhabited Dutchess County.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS  
Delivered in Person by the President  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.  
September 21, 1939, 2.00 P. M.

(TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:)

MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I have asked the Congress to reassemble in extraordinary session in order that it may consider and act on the amendment of certain legislation, which, in my best judgment, so alters the historic foreign policy of the United States that it impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations.

At the outset I proceed on the assumption that every member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and every member of the Executive Branch of the Government, including the President and his associates, personally and officially, are equally and without reservation in favor of such measures as will protect the neutrality, the safety and the integrity of our country and at the same time keep us out of war. (Applause and cheers)

Because I am wholly willing to ascribe an honorable desire for peace to those who hold different views from my own as to what those measures should be, I trust that these gentlemen will be sufficiently generous to ascribe equally lofty purposes to those with whom they disagree. (Applause) Let no man or group in any walk of

life assume exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America -- because I conceive that regardless of party or section the mantle of peace (and), the mantle of patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. (Applause) Let no group assume the exclusive label of the peace "bloc". We all belong to it. (Applause)

I have at all times kept the Congress and the American people informed of events and trends in foreign affairs. I now review them in a spirit of understatement.

Since 1931 the use of force instead of the council table has constantly increased in (the settlement of) disputes between nations -- except in the Western Hemisphere where in all those years there has been only one war, now happily terminated.

During (these) those years also the building up of vast armies and navies and storehouses of war has proceeded abroad with growing speed and intensity. But, during these years, and extending back even to the days of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the United States has constantly, consistently and conscientiously done all in its power to encourage peaceful settlements, to bring about reduction of armaments and to avert threatened wars. We have done this not only because any war anywhere necessarily hurts American security and American prosperity, but because of the more important fact that any war anywhere retards the progress of morality and religion and



impairs the security of civilization itself.

For many years the primary purpose of our foreign policy has been that this nation and this government should strive to the utmost to aid in avoiding war among (other) nations. But if and when war unhappily comes, the government and the nation must exert every possible effort to avoid being drawn into the war.

The Executive Branch of the Government did its utmost, within our traditional policy of non-involvement, to aid in averting the present appalling war. Having thus striven and failed, this Government must lose no time or effort to keep (the) our nation from being drawn (into the war.) in.

In my candid judgment we shall succeed in (these) those efforts. (Applause and Cheers)

We are proud of the historical record of the United States and of all the Americans during all these years because we have thrown every ounce of our influence for peace into the scale of peace.

I note in passing what you will all remember -- the long debates of the past on the subject of what constitutes aggression, on the methods of determining who the aggressor might be, and, on who the aggressor in past wars have been. Academically this may have been instructive as it may have been of interest to historians to discuss the pros and the cons and the rights and wrongs

of the World War during the decade that followed it.

But in the light of problems of today, (and) problems of tomorrow responsibility for acts of aggression is not concealed, and the writing of the record can safely be left to future historians.

There has been sufficient realism in the United States to see how close to our own shores came dangerous paths which were being followed on other continents.

Last January I told the Congress that "a war which threatened to envelop the world in flames has been averted, but it has become increasingly clear that peace is not assured". By April last new tensions had developed; a new crisis was in the making. Several nations with whom we had had friendly, diplomatic and commercial relations had lost, or were in the process of losing, their independent identity and their very sovereignty.

During the Spring and Summer the trend was definitely toward further acts of military conquest and away from peace. As late as the end of July I spoke to members of the Congress about the definite possibility of war. I should have called it the probability of war.

And last January, also, I spoke to this Congress of the need for further warning of new threats of conquest, military and economic; of challenge to religion, to democracy and to international good faith. I said: "An ordering of society which relegates religion, democracy and

good faith among nations to the background can find no place within it for the ideals of the Prince of Peace. The United States rejects such an ordering and retains its ancient faith . . . ." (Applause)

And I said "We know what might happen to us of the United States if the new philosophies of force were to encompass the other continents and invade our own. We, no more than other nations, can afford to be surrounded by the enemies of our faith and our humanity. Fortunate it is, therefore, that in this Western Hemisphere we have, under a common ideal of democratic government, a rich diversity of resources and of peoples functioning together in mutual respect and peace."

And last January, in the same Message, I also said: "We have learned that when we deliberately try to legislate neutrality, our neutrality laws may operate unevenly and unfairly -- may actually give aid to an aggressor and deny it to the victim. The instinct of self-preservation should warn us that we ought not to let that happen any more." (Applause)

And it was because of what I foresaw last January from watching the trend of foreign affairs and their probable effect upon us that I recommended to the Congress in July of this year that changes be enacted in our neutrality law.

The essentials for American peace, American peace in (the) this war-torn world have not changed since last January nor since last July. That is why I ask you again to re-examine our own legislation.

Go back a little; Beginning with the foundation of our constitutional government in the year 1789, the American policy in respect to belligerent nations, with one notable exception, (has been) was based on international



law. Be it remembered that what we call international law has always had as its primary objectives the avoidance of causes of war and the prevention of the extension of war.

The single exception to which I refer was the policy adopted by this nation during the Napoleonic Wars, when, seeking to avoid involvement, we acted for some years under the so-called Embargo and Non-Intercourse Acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous failure -- first, because it brought our own nation close to ruin, and, second, because it was the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars in our own War of 1812. And it is merely reciting history to recall to you that one of the results of the policy of embargo and non-intercourse was the burning in 1814 of part of this Capitol in which we are assembled today.

Our next deviation by statute from the sound principles of neutrality, and peace through international law did not come for (one) a hundred and thirty years. It was the so-called Neutrality Act of 1935 -- only four years ago -- an Act continued in force by the Joint Resolution of May 1, 1937, despite grave doubts expressed as to its wisdom by many Senators and Representatives and by officials charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, including myself. I regret that the Congress passed that Act. I regret equally that I signed that Act.



On July fourteenth of this year, I asked the Congress in the cause of peace and in the interest of real American neutrality and security to take action to change that Act.

I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the Act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the laws of nations -- the embargo provisions. I ask it because they are, in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security and, above all, American peace. (Applause)

These embargo provisions, as they exist today, prevent the sale to a belligerent by an American factory, the sale of any completed implements of war but they allow the sale of many types of uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general material and supplies. They, furthermore, allow such products of industry and agriculture to be taken in American Flag ships to belligerent nations. There in itself -- under the present law -- lies definite danger to our neutrality and our peace.

From a purely material point of view what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing, final processing there when we (could) can give employment to thousands by doing it here? Incidentally, and again from the material point of view, by such employment here we automatically aid in

building up our own national defense. And if abnormal profits appear in our midst even in time of peace, as a result of (this) such an increase of our industry, I feel certain that the subject will be adequately dealt with at the coming regular session of the Congress.

Let me set forth the present paradox of the existing legislation in its simplest terms: If, prior to 1935, a general war had broken out in Europe, the United States would have sold to and bought from belligerent nations such goods and products of all kinds as the belligerent nations, with their existing facilities and geographical situations, were able to buy from us or sell to us. This would have been the normal practice under the age-old doctrines of international law. Our prior position accepted the facts of geography (and), the facts of conditions of land power and sea power and air power alike as they existed in all parts of the world. If a war had broken out in Europe (had broken out prior to) in 1935, there would have been no difference, for example, between our exports of sheets of aluminum and airplane wings; today there is an artificial legal difference. Before 1935 there would have been no difference between the export of cotton and the export of gun cotton. Today there is. Before 1935 there would have been no difference between the shipment of brass tubing in pipe form and brass tubing in shell form. Today there is. Before 1935 there would

have been no difference between the export of a motor truck and an armored motor truck. Today there is.

Let us be factual (and), let us recognize that a belligerent nation often needs wheat and lard and cotton for the survival of its population just as much as it needs anti-aircraft guns and anti-submarine depth-charges. Let those who seek to retain the present embargo position be wholly consistent. (and) Let them seek new legislation to cut off (cloth) cotton and cloth and copper and meat and wheat and a thousand other articles from all of the nations at war.

Yes, I seek a greater consistency, a greater consistency through the repeal of the embargo provisions, and a return to international law. I seek reenactment of the historic and traditional American policy which, except for the disastrous interlude of the Embargo and Non-Intercourse (Acts) law more than a quarter of a century ago, has served us well (for nearly a century and a half.) from the very beginning of our Constitutional existence.

It has been erroneously said that return to that policy might bring us nearer to war. I give to you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands to-

day. (Applause) I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict. (Applause)

And so I think that repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of (this) the issue that faces us.

The enactment of the embargo provisions did more than merely reverse our traditional policy. It had the effect of putting land powers on the same footing as naval powers, so far as sea-borne commerce was concerned. A land power which threatened war could thus feel assured, assured in advance that any prospective sea-power antagonist would be weakened through denial of its ancient right to buy anything anywhere. This, four years ago, (gave) began to give a definite advantage to one belligerent as against another, not through his own strength or geographical position, but through an affirmative act (of ours) on the part of the United States. Removal of the embargo is merely reverting to the sounder international practice, and pursuing in time of war as in time of peace our ordinary trade policies. This will be liked by some and disliked by others, depending on the view they take of the present war, but that is not the issue. The step I recom-



ment is to put this country back on (the) a solid footing of real and traditional neutrality. (Applause)

When and if -- I do not like even to mention the word "if", I would rather say "when" -- repeal of the embargo is accomplished, certain other phases of policy reinforcing American safety should be considered. And while nearly all of us are in agreement on their objectives, the only questions relate(s) to method.

I believe that American merchant vessels should, (so) as far as possible, be restricted from entering (danger) war zones. (Applause) But, war zones may change so swiftly and so frequently in the days to come, that it is impossible to fix them permanently by act of Congress; specific legislation may prevent adjustment to constant and quick change. And it seems, therefore, more practical to delimit (them) the actual geography of the war zones through action of the State Department and administrative agencies. The objective of restricting American ships from entering such zones may be attained by prohibiting such entry by the Congress; or the result can be substantially achieved by executive proclamation that all such voyages are solely at the risk of the American owners themselves.

The second objective is to prevent American citizens from traveling on belligerent vessels, (applause)

or traveling in danger areas. This can (also) be accomplished also either by legislation, through continuance in force of certain provisions of existing law, or by proclamation making it clear to all Americans that any such travel is at their own risk.

The third objective, requiring the foreign buyer to take transfer of title in this country to commodities purchased by belligerents, is also a result (which) that can be attained by legislation or substantially achieved through due notice by proclamation.

The fourth objective is the preventing of war credits to belligerents. This can be accomplished by maintaining in force existing provisions of law, or by proclamation making it clear that if credits are granted by American citizens to belligerents our Government will take no steps in the future to relieve them of risk or loss. (Applause) The result of these last two objectives will be to require all purchases to be made in cash and cargoes to be carried in the purchasers' own ships, at the purchasers' own risk. (Applause)

Two other objectives have been amply attained by existing law, namely, regulating collection of funds in this country for belligerents, and the maintenance of a license system covering import and export of arms, ammunition and implements of war. Under present enactments, such

arms cannot be carried to belligerent countries on American vessels, and this provision should not be disturbed.

The Congress, of course, should make its own choice of the method by which these safeguards are to be attained, so long as the method chosen will meet the needs of new and changing day to day situations and dangers.

To those who say that this program would involve a step toward war on our part, I reply that it offers far greater safeguards than we now possess or have ever possessed to protect American lives and property from danger. It is a positive program for giving safety. This means less likelihood of incidents and controversies which tend to draw us into conflict, as they unhappily did (in) before the last World War. There lies the road to peace!

The position of the Executive Branch of the Government is that the age-old and time-honored doctrine of international law, coupled with these positive safeguards, is better calculated than any other means to keep us out of (this) war. (Applause)

In respect to our own defense, you are aware that I have issued a proclamation setting forth "A National Emergency in Connection with the Observance, Safeguarding, and Enforcement of Neutrality and the Strengthening of the National Defense within the limits of Peace-Time Authorizations". This was done solely to make wholly constitutional



and legal certain obviously necessary measures. I have authorized increases in the personnel of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard, increases which will bring all four of them to a total still below peace-time strength as authorized by the Congress.

I have authorized the State Department to use, for the repatriation of Americans caught in the war zone, the sum of \$500,000 already authorized by the Congress.

I have authorized the addition of (one) a hundred and fifty persons to the Department of Justice to be used in the protection of the United States against subversive foreign activities within our borders. (Applause)

At this time I ask for no (other) further authority from the Congress. (Applause) At this time I see no need for further executive action under the proclamation of limited national emergency.

Therefore, I see no (valid) impelling reason for the consideration of other legislation at this extraordinary session of the Congress. (Cheers and applause)

It is, of course, possible that in the months to come unforeseen needs for further legislation may develop but they are not imperative today.

These perilous days demand cooperation between us without a trace of partisanship. Our acts must be guided by one single hard-headed thought -- keeping America out of



this war. (Applause) In that spirit, I am asking the leaders of the two major parties in the Senate and (in) the House of Representatives to remain in Washington between the close of this extraordinary session and the beginning of the regular session on January third, 1940. They have assured me that they will do so, and I expect to consult with them at frequent intervals on the course of events in foreign affairs and on the need for future action in this field, whether it be executive or legislative action.

And, further, in the event of any future danger to the security of the United States or in the event of need for any new legislation of importance, I will immediately reconvene the Congress in another extraordinary session. (Applause)

I should like to be able to offer the hope that the shadow over the world might swiftly pass. I cannot. The facts compel my stating, with candor, that darker periods may lie ahead. The disaster is not of our making; no act of ours engendered the forces which assault the foundations of civilization. And yet we find ourselves affected to the core; our currents of commerce are changing, our minds are filled with new problems, our position in world affairs has already been altered.

In such circumstances our policy must be to appreciate in the deepest sense the true American interest.

Rightly considered, this interest is not selfish. Destiny first made us, with our sister nations on this Hemisphere, joint heirs of European culture. Fate seems now to compel us to assume the task of helping to maintain in the Western world a citadel wherein that civilization may be kept alive. The peace, the integrity and the safety of the Americas -- these must be kept firm and serene. In a period when it is sometimes said that free discussion is no longer compatible with national safety, may you by your deeds show the world that we of the United States are one people, of one mind, one spirit, one clear resolution, walking before God in the light of the living.

(Applause)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
Delivered on the Occasion of the Laying of the Cornerstone  
Of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library, Hyde Park, New York  
Sunday, November 19, 1939, 3.00 P.M.

(The President was presented by Mr. Frank C. Walker.)

MR. WALKER, MY NEIGHBORS AND FRIENDS:

Half a century ago a small boy took especial delight in climbing an old tree, now unhappily gone, to pick and eat ripe sickle pears. That was about one hundred feet to the west of where (we stand) I am standing now. And just to the north he used to lie flat between the strawberry rows and eat sun warmed strawberries -- the best in the world. And in the spring of the year, in hip rubber boots, he sailed his first toy boats in the surface water formed by the melting snow(s). In the summer with his dogs he dug into (the) woodchuck holes (of) in this same field, and some of you are standing right on top of those holes at this minute. (Laughter) Indeed, the descendants of those same woodchucks still inhabit (the) this field and I hope that, under the auspices of the National Archivist, they will continue to do so for all time.

It has, therefore, been my very personal hope that this Library, and the use of it by scholars and visitors, will come to be an integral part of a country scene which the hand of man has not (greatly) changed very greatly since the days of the Indians who dwelt here three hundred years ago.

We know, for example, we know from simple deduction that these fields were cultivated by the first inhabitants of America -- for the oak trees in these fields were striplings three centuries ago and grew up in open fields as is proved to us by their wide spreading

lower branches. Therefore, they grew up in open spaces and the only open spaces in Dutchess County were the cornfields of the Indians.

Yes, this is a peaceful countryside and it seems appropriate in this November of 1939, (that) in this time of strife that we should dedicate (the) this Library to the spirit of peace -- peace for the United States and soon, we hope, peace for the world itself. (Applause)

At the same time we can express the thought that those in the days to come who seek to learn from contemporaneous documents the history of our time will gain a less superficial and more intimate and accurate view of the aspirations and purposes of all kinds of Americans who have been living in these times.

Of the papers which will come to rest here I personally attach less importance to the documents of those who have occupied high public or private office than I do to the spontaneous letters which have come to me and my family and my associates from men, from women and from children in every part of the United States, telling me of their conditions (and), their problems, and giving me their (own) opinions.

To you who have come here today to take part in the laying of the cornerstone, you who have contributed so greatly to the building of (this) the Library, and to you who have also helped but who could not be present, I give my appreciation and thanks and I add, too, my very sincere thanks to all the workmen and the foremen who have made possible this splendid beginning in this building.

(This wholly) It is an adequate building, it is going to be a wholly adequate building and it will be turned over, as you know, to the Government of the United States next summer without any cost



whatsoever to the taxpayers of the country. During the following year the manuscripts, the letters, the books, the pictures and the models will be placed in their appropriate settings and the collections will be ready for public inspection and use, we hope, by the spring of 1941. And may I add, in order that my good friends of the press will have something to write about tomorrow, that I hope they will give due interpretation to the expression of my hope that, when we open the building to the public, it will be a fine day. (Laughter - applause)

All of you who have been so generous in making this Library possible -- all of my friends and associates who have given so greatly of their time and their interest in the planning of the work -- all of you will join me, I know, in feeling well rewarded if for generations to come the people of the United States approve our planning and believe that the life of our Nation has been thereby enriched.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS  
Delivered in Person to the Joint Assembly  
January 3, 1938

MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE SENATE AND OF THE HOUSE  
OF REPRESENTATIVES:

(To the Congress of the United States:)

I wish you all a very Happy New Year.

In addressing the Congress on the state of the Union present facts and future hazards demand that I speak clearly and earnestly of the causes which underlie events of profound concern to all.

In spite of the determination of this Nation for peace, it has become clear that acts and policies of nations in other parts of the world have far-reaching effects not only upon their immediate neighbors but also on us.

I am thankful that I can tell you that our Nation is at peace. (Applause) It has been kept at peace despite provocations which in other days, because of their seriousness could well have engendered war. The people of the United States and the Government of the United States have shown capacity for restraint and a civilized approach to the purposes of peace, while at the same time we maintain the integrity inherent in the sovereignty of 130,000,000 people, -- we maintain it lest we weaken or destroy our influence for peace and jeopardize the sovereignty itself.

It is our traditional policy to live at peace with other nations. More than that, we have been among the leaders in advocating the use of pacific methods of discussion and conciliation in international differences. We have striven for the reduction of military forces.

But in a world of high tension and disorder, in a world where stable civilization is actually threatened, it becomes the responsibility of each nation which strives for peace at home and peace with and among others to be strong enough to assure the observance of those fundamentals of peaceful solutions of conflicts which are the only ultimate basis for orderly existence.

Resolute in our determination to respect the rights of others, and to command respect for the rights of ourselves, we must keep ourselves adequately strong in national (self) defense.

There is a trend, a trend in the world away from the observance both of the letter and the spirit of treaties. We propose to observe, as we have in the past, our own treaty obligations to the limit; but we cannot be certain of reciprocity on the part of others.

This disregard for treaty obligations seems to have followed the surface trend away from the democratic representative form of government. It would seem, therefore, that world peace through international agreements, is most safe in the hands of democratic representative governments -- or, in other words, peace is most greatly jeopardized in and by those nations where democracy has been discarded or has never developed. (Applause)

I have used the words "surface trend," for I still believe that civilized man increasingly insists and in the long run will insist on genuine participation in his own government. Our people believe that over the years democracies of the world will survive, (and) that democracy will be restored or established in those nations which today know it not. And in that faith lies the future peace of

mankind. (Applause)

---

At home, conditions call for my equal candor. Events of recent months are new proof that we cannot conduct a national government after the practice of 1787, or 1837 or 1887, for the obvious reason that human needs and human desires are infinitely greater, infinitely more difficult to meet than in any previous period in the life of our Republic. Hitherto it has been an acknowledged duty of Government to meet these desires and needs; nothing has occurred of late to absolve the Congress, the Courts or the President from that task. It faces us -- as squarely and as insistently, as in March, 1933.

Much of the trouble in our own lifetimes has sprung from a long period of inaction -- from ignoring what fundamentally was happening to us, and from a time-serving unwillingness to face facts as they forced themselves upon us.

Our national life rests on two nearly equal producing forces, agriculture and industry, each of them employing about (one) a third of our citizens. The other third transports and distributes the products of the first two, or performs special services for the whole.

(The) This first great force, agriculture -- and with it the production of timber and minerals and other natural resources -- went forward feverishly and thoughtlessly until nature rebelled and we saw deserts encroach, floods destroy, trees disappear and soil exhausted.



At the same time we have been discovering that vast numbers of our farming population live in a poverty more abject than that of many of the farmers of Europe whom we are wont to call peasants; that the prices of our products of agriculture are too often dependent on speculation by non-farming groups; and that foreign nations, eager to become self-sustaining or ready to put virgin land under the plough, are no longer buying our surpluses of cotton and wheat and lard and tobacco and fruit as they had before.

Since 1933 we have knowingly faced a choice of three remedies. First, to cut our cost of farm production below that of other nations -- an obvious impossibility in many crops today unless we revert to human slavery or its equivalent.

Second, to make the government the guarantor of farm prices and the underwriter of excess farm production without limit -- a course which would bankrupt the strongest government, the strongest government in the world in a decade.

Third, to place the primary responsibility directly on the farmers themselves, under the principle of majority rule, so that they may decide, with full knowledge of the facts of surpluses and scarcities, world markets and domestic needs, what the planting of each crop should be in order to maintain a reasonably adequate supply which will assure a minimum adequate price under the normal processes of the law of supply and demand.

That adequacy -- that means adequacy of supply, (but) not glut. It means adequate reserves against the day of drought and it is shameless misrepresentation to call this a policy of scarcity. It is in truth insurance before the fact, instead of government

subsidy after the fact. (Applause)

Any such plan for the control of excessive surpluses and the speculation they bring has two enemies. There are those well-meaning theorists who harp on the inherent right of every free born American to do with his land what he wants -- to cultivate it well -- or badly; to conserve his timber by cutting only the annual increment thereof -- or to strip it clean, let fire burn the slash, and erosion complete the ruin; to raise only one crop -- and if that crop fails, to look for food and support from his neighbors or his government.

That, I assert, is not an inherent right of citizenship. For if a man farms his land to the waste of the soil or the trees, he destroys not only his own assets but the Nation's assets as well. Or if by his methods he makes himself, year after year, a financial hazard of the community and the government, he becomes not only a social problem but an economic menace. The day has gone by when it could be claimed that government has no interest in such ill-considered practices and no right through representative methods to stop them. (Applause)

The other group of enemies is perhaps less well-meaning. It includes those who for partisan purposes oppose each and every practical effort to help the situation, and also those who make money from undue fluctuations in crop prices.

I gladly note that measures which seek to initiate a government program for a balanced agriculture are now in conference between the two Houses of the Congress. In their final consideration, I hope for a sound consistent measure which will keep the cost of its administration within the figure of current government expenditures

in aid of agriculture. For the farmers of this Nation know that a balanced output can be put into effect without excessive cost and with the cooperation of the great majority of them.

If this balance can be created by an all-weather farm program, our farm population will soon be assured of relatively constant purchasing power. And from this will flow two other results -- two other practical results: the consuming public will be protected against excessive food and textile prices, and the industries of the Nation and their workers will find a steadier demand for their wares sold to the agricultural third of our people.

But to raise the purchasing power of the farmer is (however) not enough. It will not stay raised if we do not also raise the purchasing power of that third of the Nation which receives its income from industrial employment. Millions of industrial workers receive pay so low that they have little buying power. Aside from the undoubted fact that they thereby suffer great human hardship, they are unable to buy adequate food and shelter, to maintain health or to buy their share of manufactured goods.

We have not only seen minimum wage and maximum hour provisions prove their worth throughout this country economically and socially under government auspices in 1933 and (19)34 and (19)35, but the people of this country, by an overwhelming vote, are in favor of having the Congress -- this Congress -- put a floor below which industrial wages shall not fall, (applause) and a ceiling beyond which the hours of industrial labor shall not rise. (Applause)

Here again let us analyze the opposition. A part of it is sincere in believing that an effort thus to raise the purchasing

power of the lowest paid industrial workers is not the business of the Federal Government. Others give "lip service" to a general objective, but they do not like any specific measure that is proposed. (Applause) In both cases it is worth our while to wonder whether some of these opponents are not at heart opposed to any program for raising the wages of the underpaid or reducing the hours of the over-worked. (Applause)

Still another group opposes legislation of this type on the ground that cheap labor will help their locality to acquire industries and outside capital, or to retain industries which today are surviving only because of existing low wages and long hours. It has been my thought that, especially during these past five years, this Nation has grown away from local or sectional selfishness and toward national patriotism and unity. I am disappointed by some recent actions and by some recent utterances (which) that sound more like the philosophy of half a century ago. (Applause)

Yes, there are many communities in the United States where the average family income is pitifully low. It is in those communities that we find the poorest educational facilities and the worst conditions of health. Why? It is not because they are satisfied to live as they do. It is because those communities have the lowest per capita wealth and income; therefore, the lowest ability to pay taxes; and, therefore, inadequate functioning of local government.

Such communities exist in the East, in the Middle West, in the Far West, and in the South. Those who represent such areas in every part of the country do their constituents ill service by blocking efforts to raise their incomes, their property values and, there-



fore, their whole (scale) standard of living. (Applause) And I think it is worth remembering that in the long run, the profits from child labor, low pay and overwork enure not to the locality or the region where they exist but to the absentee owners who have sent their capital into these exploited communities to gather larger profits for themselves. (Applause) I am certain, indeed, that new enterprises and new industries which bring permanent wealth will come more readily to those communities which insist on good pay and reasonable hours, for the simple reason that there they will find a greater industrial efficiency and happier workers.

No reasonable person seeks a complete uniformity (in) of wages in every part of the United States; nor does any reasonable person seek an immediate and drastic change from the lowest pay to the highest pay. We are seeking, of course, only legislation to end starvation wages and intolerable hours; more desirable wages are and should continue to be the product of collective bargaining.

Many of those who represent great cities have shown their understanding of the necessity of helping the agricultural third of the Nation. I hope that those who represent constituencies primarily agricultural will not underestimate the importance of extending like aid to the industrial third. (Applause)

Wage and hour legislation, therefore, is a problem which is definitely before this Congress for action. It is an essential part of economic recovery. It has the support of an overwhelming majority of our people in every walk of life. They have expressed themselves through the ballot box.

Again I revert to the increase of national purchasing

power as an underlying necessity of the day. If you increase that purchasing power for the farmers and for the industrial workers -- especially for those in both groups who have least of it today -- you will increase the purchasing power of the final third of our population -- those who transport and distribute the products of farm and factory, and those of the professions who serve all three groups. I have tried to make clear to you, and through you to the people of the United States, that this is an urgency which must be met by complete and not by partial action.

If it is met -- if the purchasing power of the Nation as a whole -- in other words, the total of the Nation's income -- can be still further increased -- other happy results will flow from such increase.

We have raised the Nation's income from thirty-eight billion dollars in the year 1932 to about sixty-eight billion dollars in the year 1937. (Applause) And our goal, our objective is to raise it to ninety or (one) a hundred billion dollars.

We have heard much about a balanced budget, and it is interesting to note that many of those who have pleaded for a balanced budget as the sole need now come to me to plead for additional government expenditures at the expense of unbalancing the budget. As the Congress is fully aware, the annual deficit, large for several years, has been declining the last fiscal year and this. The proposed budget for 1939, which I shall shortly send to the Congress, will exhibit a further decrease in the deficit, though not a balance between income and outgo.

To many who have pleaded with me for an immediate balancing

of the budget, by a sharp curtailment or even elimination of government functions, I have asked (the) this question -- "What present expenditures would you reduce or eliminate?" And the invariable answer has been, "That is not my business -- I know nothing of the details, but I am sure that it could be done." That is not what you or I would call helpful citizenship.

On only one point do most of them have a suggestion. They think that relief for the unemployed by the giving of work is wasteful, and when I pin them down I discover that at heart they are actually in favor of substituting a dole in place of useful work. To that neither I nor, I am confident, the Senators and Representatives in the Congress will ever consent. (Applause)

I am as anxious, just as anxious as any banker or industrialist or business man or investor or economist that the budget of the United States Government be brought into balance as quickly as possible. But I lay down certain conditions which seem reasonable and which I believe all should accept.

The first condition is that we continue the policy of not permitting any needy American who can and is willing to work to starve because the Federal Government does not provide the work. (Applause)

The second is that the Congress and the Executive join hands in eliminating or curtailing any Federal activity which can be eliminated or curtailed or even postponed without harming necessary government functions or the safety of the Nation from a national point of view. The third is to raise the purchasing power of the Nation to the point that the taxes on this purchasing power -- or, in other words, on the Nation's income -- will be sufficient to meet the necessary ex-



penditures of the national government.

I have hitherto stated that, in my judgment, the expenditures of the national government cannot be cut much below seven billion dollars a year without destroying essential functions or letting people starve. That sum can be raised and will be cheerfully provided by the American people, if we can increase the Nation's income to a point well beyond the present level.

This does not mean that as the Nation's income goes up the Federal expenditures should rise in proportion. On the contrary, the Congress and the Executive should use every effort to hold the normal Federal expenditures to approximately the present level, thus making it possible, with an increase in the Nation's income and the resulting increase in tax receipts, not only to balance future budgets but to reduce the debt as well.

In line with this policy fall my former recommendations for the reorganization and improvement of the administrative structure of the government, both for immediate Executive needs and for the planning of future national needs. I renew those recommendations.

And in relation to tax changes, several matters (three things) should be kept in mind. First, the total sum to be derived by the Federal Treasury must not be decreased as a result of any changes in schedules. Second, abuses by individuals or corporations designed to escape tax-paying by using various methods of doing business, corporate and otherwise -- abuses which we have sought, with great success, to end -- must not be restored. And third, we should rightly change certain provisions where they are proven to work definite hardship, especially on the small business men of the Nation. But, speculative



income should not be favored over earned income. (Applause)

I suppose it is human nature to argue that this or that tax is responsible for every ill. And it is human nature on the part of those who pay graduated taxes to attack all taxes based on the principle of ability to pay. These are the same complainants who for a whole generation and more blocked the imposition of a graduated income tax. They are the same complainants who would impose the type of flat sales tax which places the burden of government more on those least able to pay and less on those most able to pay.

Our conclusion, therefore, must be that while proven hardships should be corrected, they should not be corrected in such a way as to restore abuses already terminated or to shift a greater burden to the less fortunate.

This subject leads naturally into the wider field of the public attitude toward business. The objective of increasing the purchasing power of the farming third, the industrial third and the service third of our population presupposes the cooperation and support of what we call capital and labor.

Capital is essential; reasonable earnings on capital are essential; but misuse of the powers of capital or selfish suspension of the employment of capital must be ended, or the capitalistic system will destroy itself through its own abuses. (Applause)

The overwhelming majority of business men and bankers intend to be good citizens. Only a small minority have displayed poor citizenship by engaging in practices which are dishonest or definitely harmful to society. This statement is straightforward and true.

And no person in any responsible place in the Government of the United States today has ever taken any position contrary to it.

But, unfortunately for the (country) Nation, when attention is called to, or attack is made on specific misuses of capital, there has been a deliberate purpose on the part of some people, including the condemned minority, to distort the criticism (into) to make it appear an attack on all capital. That is willful deception but it does not long deceive.

If attention is called to, or attack made on, certain wrongful business practices, there are those who are eager to call it "an attack on all business." That too is willful deception that will not long deceive.

Let us consider certain facts:

There are practices today which most people believe should be ended. They include tax avoidance through corporate and other methods, which I have previously mentioned; excessive capitalization, investment write-ups (and), security manipulations; price rigging and collusive bidding in defiance of the spirit of the anti-trust laws by methods which baffle prosecution under the present statutes. They include high pressure salesmanship which creates the cycles of overproduction within given industries and consequent recessions in production until such time as the surplus is consumed; the use of patent laws to enable larger corporations to maintain high prices and withhold from the public the advantages of the progress of science; unfair competition which drives the smaller producer out of business locally or regionally or even on a national scale; intimidation of local or state government to prevent the enactment of laws

for the protection of labor by threatening to move elsewhere; the shifting of actual production by one corporation from one locality or region to another in pursuit of the cheapest wage scale.

The enumeration of these abuses, and they do not include them all, does not mean that business as a whole is guilty of them. Again, it is deception that will not long deceive to tell the country that an attack on these abuses is an attack on business.

Another group of problems affecting business, which cannot be termed specific abuses, gives us food for grave thought about the future. Generically such problems arise out of the concentration of economic control to the detriment of the body politic -- control of other people's money, other people's labor, other people's lives.

In many instances such concentrations cannot be justified on the ground of operating efficiency, but we have -- they have been created for the sake of securities profits, financial control, the suppression of competition and the ambition for power over others. In some lines of industry a very small numerical group is in such a position of influence that its actions are of necessity followed by the other units, the small units, operating in the same field.

That such influences operate to control banking and finance is, of course, equally true, in spite of the many efforts, through Federal legislation, to take such control out of the hands of a small group. We have but to talk with hundreds of small bankers throughout the United States to realize that irrespective of local conditions, they are compelled in practice to accept the policies laid down by a small number of the larger banks in the Nation. The work undertaken by Andrew Jackson and Woodrow Wilson is not finished

yet. (Applause)

The ownership of vast properties or the organization of thousands of workers creates a heavy obligation of public service. The power should not be sought (or), the power should not be sanctioned unless the responsibility is accepted as well. The man who seeks freedom from such responsibility in the name of individual liberty is either fooling himself or trying to cheat his fellow men. He wants to eat the fruits of orderly society without paying for them.

As a Nation we have rejected any and all radical revolutionary programs. For a permanent correction of grave weaknesses in our economic system we have relied on new applications of old democratic processes. It is not necessary to recount what has been accomplished in preserving the homes and livelihood of millions of workers on farms and in cities, in reconstructing a sound banking and credit system, in reviving trade and industry, in reestablishing security of life and property. All we need today is to look upon the fundamental, sound economic conditions to know that this business recession causes more perplexity than fear on the part of most people (applause) and to contrast our prevailing mental attitude with the terror and despair of five years ago.

Furthermore, we have a new moral climate in America. That means that we ask business and finance to recognize that fact, to cure such inequalities as they can cure without legislation but to join their government in the enactment of legislation where the ending of abuses and the steady functioning of our economic system calls for government assistance. The Nation has no obligation to make America safe either for incompetent business men or for business men



who fail to note the trend of the times and continue the use of machinery of economics and practices of finance as outworn as the cotton spindle of 1870. (Applause)

Government can be expected to cooperate in every way with the business of the Nation provided the component parts of business abandon practices which do not belong to this day and age, and adopt price and production policies appropriate to (the times) 1937.

In regard to the relationship of government to certain processes of business, to which I have referred, it seems clear to me that existing laws undoubtedly require reconstruction. I expect, therefore, to address the Congress in a special message on this subject, and I hope to have the help of business in the efforts of government to help business. (Applause)

I have spoken of labor as another essential in the three great groups of the population in raising the Nation's income. Definite strides in collective bargaining have been made and the right of labor to organize has been nationally (recognized) accepted. Nevertheless in the evolution of the process difficult situations have arisen in localities and among groups. Unfortunate divisions relating to jurisdiction among the workers themselves have retarded production within given industries and have, therefore, affected related industries. The construction of homes (and), the construction of other buildings has been hindered in some localities not only by unnecessarily high prices for materials but also by certain hourly wage scales.

For economic and for social reasons our principal interest for the near future lies along two lines: First, the immediate

desirability of increasing the wages of the lowest paid groups in all industry; and, second, in thinking in terms of (regularizing) expanding the work of the individual worker more greatly through the year -- in other words, in thinking more in terms of the worker's total pay for a period of (a whole year) 365 days rather than in terms of his remuneration by the hour or by the day.

In the case of labor as in the case of capital, misrepresentation of the policy of the Government of the United States is deception which will not long deceive. In both cases we seek cooperation. In every case power and responsibility must go hand in hand.

I have spoken of economic causes which throw the Nation's income out of balance; I have spoken of practices and abuses (which) that demand correction through the cooperation of capital and labor with the government. But no government can help the destinies of people who insist on putting (sectional and) class consciousness and sectional consciousness ahead of general weal. There must be proof that sectional and class interests are prepared more greatly than they are today to be national in outlook.

A government cannot punish specific acts of spoliation -- the Government can punish those, but no government can conscript cooperation. We have improved some matters by way of remedial legislation. But where in some particulars that legislation has failed we cannot be sure whether it fails because some of its details, because they are unwise or because (it is) they are being sabotaged. At any rate, we hold our objectives and our principles to be sound. And we will never go back on them. (Applause)

Government has a final responsibility for the well-being of its citizenship. If private cooperative endeavor fails to provide work for willing hands and relief for the unfortunate, those suffering hardship from no fault of their own have a right to call upon the government for aid; and a government worthy of its name (must) will make fitting response.

It is the opportunity (and), it is the duty of all those who have faith in democratic methods as applied in industry, in agriculture and in business, as well as in the field of politics, to do their utmost to cooperate with government -- without regard to political affiliation, special interests or economic prejudices, -- in whatever program may be sanctioned by the chosen representatives of the people.

And that presupposes on the part of the representatives of the people a program, its enactment and its administration.

Not because of the pledges of party programs alone, not because of the clear policies of the past five years, but chiefly because of the need of national unity in ending mistakes of the past and meeting the necessities of today, we must carry on.

I do not propose to let the people down.

I am sure the Congress of the United States will not let the people down. (Prolonged applause)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
Delivered at the Jackson Day Dinner  
Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.  
January 8, 1938

MR. VICE PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, MR. FARLEY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

When speaking before a party gathering in these modern (times) days, I am happy to realize that the audience is not confined to active members of my own party, and that there is less of unthinking partisanship in this country today than at any time since the Administration of (President) George Washington.

In the last campaign, in 1936, a very charming lady wrote me a letter (as follows). She said: "I believe in you and (in what you are trying to do for the Nation) I do wish I could vote for you -- but you see my parents were Republicans and I was brought up as a Republican and so I have to vote for your opponent." (Laughter)

And my reply to her ran as follows: "My father and grandfather were Democrats and I was born and brought up as a Democrat, but in 1904, when I cast my first vote for a President, I voted for the Republican candidate, Theodore Roosevelt, because I thought he was a better Democrat than the Democratic candidate." (Applause)

I have told that story many times, and if I had to do it over again I would not alter that vote. (Applause)

Conditions and parties change, as we know, with every generation. Nevertheless, I cannot help but feel pride in the fact that the Democratic Party, as it exists today, is a national party (reflecting) representing the essential unity of (the whole) our country. And as we move forward under our present momentum, it is not only necessary but it is right that the Party (slough) should stop off any remains of



sectionalism and class consciousness. Party progress cannot stop just because some public officials and private or local groups fail to move along with the times. Their places will be amply filled by the (rising) arriving generation. That is on the principle that "Nature abhors a vacuum." (Laughter and applause)

In these recent years the average American seldom thinks of Jefferson (and) or Jackson as Democrats or of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt as Republicans -- (but) he labels each one of them according to his attitude toward the fundamental problems that confronted him as President, when he was active in the affairs of government.

These men stand out because of the constructive battles they waged, not merely battles against things that were temporarily evil but battles for things that were permanently good -- battles for the basic morals of democracy, which rest on respect -- respect for the right of self-government and faith in majority rule.

They knew, with the wisdom of experience, that the majority often makes mistakes. But they believed passionately that rule by a small minority class unfailingly makes for far worse mistakes -- for rule by class takes counsel from itself and fails to heed the problems and, therefore, the good of all kinds and conditions of men. In the long run the instincts of the common man, willing to live and let live, they work out -- those instincts -- the best and safest balance for the common good. And that is what I mean by the battle to restore and maintain the moral integrity of democracy.

At heart some of the small minority on the other side seek and use power to make themselves masters instead of servants of mankind. At heart they oppose our American form of government.

That is the cause, the cause of the great struggle that we are engaged in today -- a struggle for the maintenance of the integrity of the morals of democracy. And we are in the process of winning it. (Applause)

Let me talk history. President Washington, feeling his way through the organizing years of the infant Republic, questioned whether government would not be most safely conducted by the minority of education and of wealth.

But Jefferson saw that this control, if long exercised by a minority, would be destructive of a sound, representative, democratic system. He preached the extension of the franchise and government more responsive to the (popular) public will.

Against (him) Jefferson were almost all the newspapers and magazines of the day. And so, to disseminate (their) his policies in every hamlet and town his associates resorted to printing simple leaflets and pamphlets.

We know that the handful of printers and editors who helped them were harried and arrested under the sedition law with the full approval of the (great) papers and magazines of (the day) that time. (This) That, my friends, was the first effort, with the cooperation of the owners of the press, to curb the essential freedom of the press. And it failed just as any similar effort would fail today. (Applause)

Time went by. Men were not eternally vigilant and once more the control of national affairs was maneuvered into the hands of a group of citizens small in number. The government's face was turned toward the handful of citizens of the seaboard (who) -- that

small group that owned the Bank of the United States and the great merchant and shipping companies. The government's back was turned on the tens of thousands of pioneers who were settling the mountain regions and spreading over into the new country that lay westward to the Mississippi.

Jackson took up the battle of these pioneers of the West (and South) and the battle of the inarticulate poor of the great cities. For that, like Jefferson, he was called a rabble rouser.

He had to fight the same evil Jefferson fought -- the control of government, government itself, by a small minority instead of by a popular opinion duly headed by the Congress, the Courts and the President.

The Bank of the United States was the purse and sword of the opposition, and with it were aligned all those who, like the early Federalists in Jefferson's (day) time, were at heart in favor of control by the few.

With it were aligned all of the nationally known press of the day, with the exception of three newspapers. The Bank sought to array all the money in the country against him.

No one who reads the history of (their) that period can allege that either Jefferson or Jackson attacked all (of the) bankers, all (of) the merchants or all of those of wealth. Nor can anyone say that even a majority of these elements (in) of the population were opposed to either one of them.

The fight was won -- as all such fights are won in the long run (applause)-- won because Jackson was fighting on the side of the people, whose instincts did not fail him. He was fighting

for the integrity of the morals of democracy. (Applause)

Another generation went by. Lincoln emerged -- and was scorned for his uncouthness, his simplicity, his homely stories and his solicitude for the little man. He faced opposition far behind his battle lines from those who thought first and last of their own selfish aims -- (by) gold speculators in Wall Street who cheered defeats of their own armies because thereby the price of their gold (might) would rise; (by) army contractors who founded fortunes at the expense of the boys at the front -- a minority unwilling to support their people and their government unless the government would leave them free to pursue their private gains.

(He) Lincoln, too, fought for the morals of democracy -- and had he lived the south would have been allowed to rehabilitate itself on the basis of those morals instead of being "reconstructed" by martial law and carpetbaggers. (Applause)

There followed, as we remember, after 1865, and lasting for many years, an uninspired commercialized era in our national life, lighted briefly by the stubborn integrity of Grover Cleveland.

Then came Theodore Roosevelt and resurgence of the morals of democracy. He, too, preached majority rule to end the autocracy of the same old type of opposition. He pleaded for decency -- strenuous decency -- in public as well as in private life. He laughed at those who called him unprintable names, and challenged again the small minority (which) that claimed vested rights to power.

You and I, in our day and generation, know how Wilson carried on (the) his fight. (Applause) If the cataclysm of the World War had not stopped his hand, neither you nor I would today



be facing such a difficult task of reconstruction and reform.

(On the eighth of every January we honor Andrew Jackson (for his unending contribution to the vitality of our democracy. (We look back on his amazing personality, we review his battles (because the struggles he went through, the enemies he encountered, (the defeats he suffered and the victories he won are part and parcel of the struggles, the enmities, the defeats and the victories (of those who have lived in all the generations that have followed.)

In our Nation today we have still the continuing menace of a comparatively small number of people who honestly believe in their superior right to influence and direct government, (and) who are unable to see or unwilling to admit that the practices by which they maintain their privileges are harmful to the body politic.

After Jefferson's election in 1800, an election over their violent opposition, such people (said to him) came to him and said -- "Let us alone -- do not destroy confidence." After Jackson had won his fight against the Bank of the United States, they said the same thing. They said it to Lincoln, they said it to Theodore Roosevelt, and they said it to Wilson. Strangely enough, although they had no confidence in a people's government, they demanded that a people's government have confidence in them. (Applause)

In my Message to the Congress on Monday last, I made it abundantly clear that this Administration seeks to serve the needs, and to make effective the will, of the overwhelming majority of our citizens and seeks to curb only abuses of power and privilege by small minorities. Thus we in turn are striving to uphold the integrity of the morals of our democracy. (Applause)

There is an ancient strategy (which we have seen recently employed) recently used whereby those who would exploit or dominate a people, seek to delude their victims into fighting their battles for them. And in these days of organized nation-wide publicity, the strategy for undermining a government (attack upon) move against minority abuses is to make this appear to be an attack upon the exploited majority itself. Thus during the past few months attacks on the misuse of concentrated power have been distorted into attacks upon all business big and little and upon our whole system of private profit and private enterprise. During the past few days I have been happy to note a definite improvement of understanding on the part of many who have been led to follow this false guidance. (Applause)

(The source and influence of such misguidance of public opinion can be easily located.)

I was interested the other day to read the report of a correspondent of a London financial magazine who had recently surveyed conditions in (the) our Middle West and other parts of the Nation. He found a point of view in other parts of the country wholly different from that of the principal financial centers such as New York and Philadelphia and Chicago. And he found this other interesting development. Wherever an enterprise is controlled locally its managers have a local independent point of view. But when the business is controlled from great financial centers, the local manager takes his cue from what his bosses are saying hundreds of miles away (and reflects the state of mind prevailing hundreds of miles away). (Applause)

That, from an outsider, confirms our traditional democratic

antagonism to concentration of control over large areas of industry beyond the needs of operating efficiency and it strengthens our resolve to outlaw the methods by which such control is achieved and to reestablish the independence of local (or) and regional enterprise.

Let me give you an example. As you know, I have been discussing the problem of the electric utilities -- discussing the problem with business men and lawyers and public officials during the past month or (two) so.

I am convinced that the great majority of local or regional operating utility companies can come to an understanding with the government, Federal and state and local, and with the people of the territories which they serve. That would enable them to obtain, within their own localities or regions, all of the new capital necessary for the extension or improvement of their services.

But most of these operating companies are owned by distant holding companies -- pyramided holding companies -- which are finance companies and not operating (utility) companies. Very few investors in this country of ours who invested in the operating companies have lost money. But thousands of investors have lost their money in buying holding company securities which had Blue Sky above them instead of tangible assets behind them. (Applause)

That evil of utility holding company control (will not) is not going to grow in the days to come because this government of ours has now passed laws to prevent similar occurrences in the future. (Applause) But we have not yet corrected the existing evils that flow from mistakes of (the past) prior administrations. And we cannot condone their continuance.



It has been estimated, I think fairly accurately, that there are outstanding some \$13,000,000,000. worth of electric utility securities and that the substantial control of this total is vested in the hands of the owners of less than \$600,000,000. of the total. That means that the ownership of about four per cent of the securities controls the other ninety-six per cent.

(Here is) There, my friends, is the case of a ninety-six inch dog being wagged by a four inch tail. (Laughter -- applause -- prolonged) If you work it out in feet and inches it is an amazing dog. But think of the power of that four inches. (Applause)

I have recently described other things that cannot be reduced to terms of natural history (laughter) -- (many) other activities (that should) which nevertheless ought not to be tolerated in our democracy -- price rigging, unfair competition directed against the little man, and monopolistic practices of (many) all kinds. Call them evils, call them abuses, call them unfortunate facts. It makes no difference to me. Give to me and give to your government the credit for a definite intention to eradicate them. (Applause) Give to me and give to your government the credit for believing that in so doing we are helping and not hurting the overwhelming majority of business men and industrialists (in) throughout the United States.

And we hope and believe that these evils and abuses and unfortunate actions will in greater part be eliminated by the cooperative action of that overwhelming majority.

The White House door is open -- I am forgetting about that famous key just now -- the White House door is open to all our citizens who come offering to help eradicate the evils that flow from



that undue concentration of economic power or unfair business practices -- who offer to do all that is possible by cooperative endeavor and to aid in corrective and helpful legislation where that is necessary.

We know that there will be a few -- a mere handful of the total of business men and bankers and industrialists -- who will fight to the last ditch to retain such autocratic control(s) over the industry and the finances of the country as they now possess. With this handful it is going to be a fight -- a cheerful fight on my part, but a fight in which there will be no compromise with evil -- no letup until the inevitable day of victory. (Applause)

Once more -- once more the head of the Nation is working with all his might and main to restore and to uphold the integrity of the morals of democracy -- our heritage from the long line of national leadership -- from Jefferson to Wilson -- and preeminently from old Andrew Jackson himself. (Prolonged applause)

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
To the Congress of the United States  
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.  
January 3, 1940

(TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES:)

MR. VICE PRESIDENT, MR. SPEAKER, MEMBERS OF THE SENATE  
AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I wish each and every one of you a very happy  
New Year. (Applause)

As the Congress reassembles, the impact of the  
wars abroad makes it natural, I think, to approach "the  
state of the union" through a discussion of foreign af-  
fairs.

But it is important that those who hear and  
read this message should in no way confuse that approach  
with any thought that our Government is abandoning, or  
even overlooking, the great significance of its domestic  
policies.

The social and the economic forces which have  
been mismanaged abroad until they have resulted in revolu-  
tion, and dictatorship and war are the same as those which  
we here are struggling to adjust peacefully and at home.

You are well aware that dictatorships -- and the  
philosophy of force (which) that justifies and accompanies  
dictatorships -- have originated in almost every case in  
the necessity for drastic action to improve internal  
conditions in places where democratic action for one reason  
or another has failed to respond to modern needs and modern

demands.

It was with far-sighted wisdom that the framers of (the) our Constitution brought together in one magnificent phrase three great concepts -- "common defense", "general welfare" and "domestic tranquility".

More than a century and a half later on we who are here today still believe with them that our best defense is the promotion of our general welfare and domestic tranquility.

In previous messages to the Congress I have repeatedly warned that, whether we like it or not, the daily lives of American citizens will, of necessity, feel the shock of events on other continents. And this is no longer mere theory (for) because it has been definitely proved to us by the facts of yesterday and today.

To say that the domestic well-being of (one) a hundred and thirty million Americans is deeply affected by the well-being or the ill-being of the populations of other nations is only to recognize in world affairs the truth that we all accept in home affairs.

If in any local unit -- a city, county, state or region -- low standards of living are permitted to continue, the level of the civilization of the entire nation will be pulled downward.

The identical principle extends to the rest of (a) the civilized world. But there are those who wish-

fully insist, in innocence or ignorance or both, that the United States of America as a self-contained unit can live happily and prosperously, its future secure, inside of a high wall of isolation while, outside, the rest of civilization and the commerce and the culture of mankind are shattered throughout.

I can understand the feelings of those who warn the nation that they will never again consent to the sending of American youth to fight on the soil of Europe. But, as I remember, nobody has asked them to consent -- for nobody expects such an undertaking. (Applause)

The overwhelming majority of our fellow citizens do not abandon in the slightest their hope and their expectation that the United States will not become involved in military participation in these wars.

I can also understand the wishfulness of those who over-simplify the whole situation by repeating that all that we have to do is to mind our own business and keep the nation out of war. But there is a vast difference between keeping out of war and pretending that this war is none of our business.

We do not have to go to war with other nations, but at least we can strive with other nations to encourage the kind of peace that will lighten the troubles of the world, and by so doing help our own nation as well. (Applause)

I ask that all of us everywhere think things



through with the single aim of how best to serve the future of our own nation. I do not mean merely its future relationship with the outside world. I mean its domestic future as well -- the work, the security, the prosperity, the happiness, the life of all the boys and girls (of) in the United States, as they are inevitably affected by such world relationships. For it becomes clearer and clearer that the future world will be a shabby and dangerous place to live in -- yes, even for Americans to live in -- if it is ruled by force, force in the hands of a few.

Already the crash of swiftly moving events all over the earth has made us all think (with) in a longer view. Fortunately, that thinking cannot be controlled by partisanship. The time is long past when any political party or any particular group can curry (and) or capture public favor by labeling itself the "peace party" or the "peace bloc". That label belongs to the whole United States and to every right thinking man, and woman and child within it. (Applause)

For out of all the military and the diplomatic turmoil, out of all the propaganda, (and) counter-propaganda of the present conflicts, there are two facts which stand out and which the whole world acknowledges.

The first is that never before has the Government of the United States of America done so much as in our recent past to establish and maintain the policy of the

Good Neighbor with its sister nations. (Applause)

And the second, the second is that in almost every nation in the world today there is a true public belief that the United States has been, and will continue to be, a potent and active factor in seeking the reestablishment of world peace. (Applause)

Yes, in these recent years we have had a clean record of peace and good-will. It is an open book, a book that cannot be twisted or defamed. It is a record that must be continued and enlarged.

So I hope that Americans everywhere will work out for themselves the several alternatives, alternatives which lie before world civilization, which necessarily includes our own.

We must look ahead and see the possibilities for our children if the rest of the world comes to be dominated by concentrated force alone -- even though today we are a very great and a very powerful nation.

We must look ahead and see the effect on our own future if all (the) small nations (throughout) of the world have their independence snatched from them or become mere appendages to relatively vast and powerful military systems.

We must look ahead and see the kind of lives our children would have to lead if a large part of the rest of the world were compelled to worship (the) a god

imposed by a military ruler, or were forbidden to worship God at all; if the rest of the world were forbidden to read and hear the facts -- the daily news of their own and other nations -- if they were deprived of the truth (which) that makes men free..

We must look ahead and see the effect on our future generations if world trade is controlled by any nation or group of nations which sets up that control through military force.

It is true, of course, (true) that the record of past centuries includes destruction of many small nations includes the enslavement of peoples, and the building of empires on the foundation of force. But wholly apart from the greater international morality which we seek today, we recognize the practical fact that with modern weapons and modern conditions, modern man can no longer (live) lead a civilized life if we are to go back to the practice of wars and conquests of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Summing up this need of looking ahead, and in words of common sense and good American citizenship, I hope that we will have fewer American ostriches in our midst. (Applause) It is not good for the ultimate health of ostriches to bury their heads in the sand.

Only an ostrich would look upon these wars through the eyes of cynicism or ridicule.



Of course, the peoples of other nations have the right to choose their own form of government. But we in this nation still believe that such choice should be predicated on certain freedoms, freedoms which we think are essential everywhere. We know that we ourselves will never be wholly safe at home unless other governments recognize such freedoms.

Twenty-one American Republics, expressing the will of two hundred and fifty million people, the will to preserve peace and freedom in this Hemisphere are displaying a unanimity of ideals and practical relationships which gives hope that what is being done here can be done on other continents. We in all the Americas are coming to the realization that we can retain our respective nationalities without, at the same time, threatening the national existence of our neighbors.

Such truly friendly relationships, for example, permit us to follow our own domestic policies with reference to our agricultural products, while at the same time we have the privilege of trying to work out mutual assistance arrangements for a world distribution of world agricultural surpluses.

And we have been able to apply the same (simple) principle, the same simple principle to many manufactured products -- surpluses of which must be sold in the world export markets if we (would) intend to continue a high



level of production and employment.

For many years after the World War, as we know today, blind economic selfishness in most countries, including our own, resulted in a destructive mine-field of trade restrictions which blocked the channels of commerce among nations. Indeed this policy was one of the contributing causes of existing wars. It dammed up vast unsaleable surpluses, helping to bring about unemployment and suffering in the United States and everywhere else.

To point the way to break up (the) that log-jam our Trade Agreements Act was passed -- based upon a policy of equality of treatment among nations and of mutually profitable arrangements of trade.

It is not correct to infer that legislative powers have been transferred from the Congress to the Executive Branch of the Government. (Everybody) Everyone recognizes that general tariff legislation is a Congressional function, but we know that, because of the stupendous task involved in the fashioning and the passing of a general tariff law, it is advisable to provide at times of emergency some flexibility to make the general law adjustable to quickly changing conditions.

And we are in such a time today. Our present trade agreement method provides a temporary flexibility and is, therefore, practical in the best sense. It should be kept alive to serve our trade interests --

agricultural and industrial -- in many valuable ways during the existing wars. (Applause)

But what is more important, the Trade Agreements Act should be extended as an indispensable part of the foundation of any stable and (durable) enduring peace.

The old conditions of world trade made for no enduring peace; and when the time comes, the United States must use its influence to open up the trade channels of the world, in all nations, in order that no one nation need feel compelled in later days to seek by force of arms what it can well gain by peaceful conference. (Applause) And so for (this) that purpose, too, we need the Trade Agreements Act even more today than when it was passed.

I emphasize the leadership which this nation can take when the time comes for a renewal of world peace. Such an influence will be greatly weakened if this Government becomes a dog in the manger of trade selfishness. (Applause)

The first President of the United States warned us against entangling foreign alliances. The present President of the United States subscribes to and follows that precept. (Applause)

(But) And I hope that most of you will agree that trade cooperation with the rest of the world does

not violate that precept in any way. (Applause)

Even as through these trade agreements we prepare to cooperate in a world that wants peace we hope, we must likewise be prepared to take care of ourselves if the world cannot attain peace.

For several years past we have been compelled to strengthen our own national defense. That has created a very large portion of our Treasury deficits. This year in the light of continuing world uncertainty, I am asking the Congress for Army and Navy increases which are based not on panic but on common sense. They are not as great as enthusiastic alarmists seek. They are not as small as unrealistic persons claiming superior private information would demand. (Applause - laughter)

As will appear in the annual budget tomorrow, the only important increase in any part of the budget is the estimate for national defense. Practically all other important items show a reduction. (Applause - cheers) But you know, you can't eat your cake and have it too. (Applause) Therefore, in the hope that we can continue in these days of increasing economic prosperity to reduce the Federal deficit, I am asking the Congress to levy sufficient additional taxes to meet the emergency spending for national defense. (Applause)

Behind the Army and Navy, of course, lies our ultimate line of defense -- "the general welfare" of our people. We cannot report, despite all the progress that



we have made in our domestic problems -- despite the fact that production is back to 1929 levels -- that all our problems are solved. The fact of unemployment of millions of men and women remains a symptom of a number of difficulties in our economic system not yet adjusted.

While the number of the unemployed has decreased very greatly, while their immediate needs for food and clothing -- as far as the Federal Government is concerned -- have been largely met, while their morale has been kept alive by giving them useful public work, we have not yet found a way to employ the surplus of our labor which the efficiency of our industrial processes has created.

We refuse the European solution of using the unemployed to build up excessive armaments which eventually result in dictatorships and war. We encourage an American way -- through an increase of national income which is the only way we can be sure will take up the slack. Much progress has been made; and much remains to be done.

We recognize that we must find an answer in terms of work and opportunity.

The unemployment problem today has become very definitely a problem of youth as well as of old age. As each year has gone by hundreds of thousands of boys and girls have come of working age. They now form an army of unused youth. They must be an especial concern of democratic government.



We must continue, above all things, to look for a solution of their special problem. For they, looking ahead to life, are entitled to action on our part and not merely to admonitions of optimism or lectures on economic laws.

Some in our midst have sought to instill a feeling of fear and defeatism in the minds of the American people about this problem.

To face the task of finding jobs faster than invention can take them away -- that is not defeatism. To warble easy platitudes that if we will only go back to ways that have failed, everything will be all right -- that is not courage. (Applause)

In 1933 we met a problem of real fear and real defeatism. (in 1933) We faced the facts -- with action and not with words alone.

The American people will reject (the) that doctrine of fear, confident that in the '30's we have been building soundly a new order of things, a new order of things different from the order of the '20's. And in this dawn of the decade of the '40's, with our program of social improvement started, we (must) will continue to carry on the processes of recovery so as to preserve our gains and provide jobs at living wages. (Applause)

There are, of course, many other items of great public interest which could be enumerated in this

message -- the continued conservation of our natural resources, the improvement of health and the bettering of education, the extension of social security to larger groups, the freeing of large areas from restricted transportation discriminations, the extension of the merit system and many others.

Our continued progress in the social and economic field is important not only for the significance of each part of it but for the total effect which our program of domestic betterment has upon that most valuable asset of a nation in dangerous times -- its national unity.

The permanent security of America in the present crisis does not lie in armed force alone. What we face is a set of world-wide forces of disintegration -- vicious, ruthless, destructive of all the moral, all the religious and all the political standards which mankind, after centuries of struggle, has come to cherish most.

In these moral values, in these forces which have made our nation great, we must actively and practically reassert our faith.

These words -- "national unity" -- must not be allowed to become merely a high sounding phrase, a vague generality, a pious hope, to which everyone can give lip-service. They must be made to have real meaning in terms of the daily thoughts and acts of every man, woman and child in our land during the coming year and during the

years that lie ahead.

For national unity is, in a very real and a very deep sense, the fundamental safeguard of all democracy.

Doctrines, doctrines that (which) set group against group, faith against faith, race against race, class against class, fanning the fires of hatred in men too despondent, too desperate to think for themselves, those doctrines were used as rabble-rousing slogans on which dictators could ride to power. And once in power they could saddle their tyrannies on whole nations, (and) saddle them on their weaker neighbors.

Yes, this is the danger to which we in America must begin to be more alert. For the apologists for foreign aggressors, and equally those selfish and partisan groups at home who wrap themselves in a false mantle of Americanism to promote their own economic, financial or political advantage, are now trying European tricks upon us, seeking to muddy the stream of our national thinking, weakening us in the face of danger, by trying to set our own people to fighting amongst themselves. Such tactics are what have helped to plunge Europe into war. We must combat them, as we would the plague, if American integrity and American security are to be preserved. We cannot afford to face the future as a disunited people. (Applause)

We must as a united people keep ablaze on this continent the flames of human liberty, of reason, of demo-



cracy and of fair play as living things to be preserved for the better world that is to come.

Overstatement, bitterness, vituperation, and the beating of drums, they have contributed mightily to ill-feeling and wars between nations. If these unnecessary and unpleasant actions are harmful in the international field, if they have hurt in other parts of the world, they are also (hurtful) harmful in the domestic scene. Peace among ourselves would seem to have some (of the) advantage, some advantage for us and in the long run for mankind as a whole. (of peace between us and other nations.) (And) In the long run history amply demonstrates that angry controversy surely wins less than calm discussion.

In the spirit, therefore, of a greater unselfishness, recognizing that the world -- including the United States of America -- passes through perilous times, I am very hopeful that the closing session of the Seventy-Sixth Congress will consider the needs of the nation and of humanity with calmness, with tolerance and with cooperative wisdom.

May the year 1940 be pointed to by our children as another period when democracy justified its existence as the best instrument of government yet devised by mankind. (Applause - cheers)



ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
At the Jackson Day Dinner, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.  
January 8, 1940

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, CANDIDATES HERE AND  
CANDIDATES THERE: (Laughter)

First I want to assure you, in the opinion of  
the Attorney General, that you are all legally here.

(Laughter)

Once upon a time, and in a campaign year every  
speech ought to start out that way, once upon a time there  
was a school teacher, and the school teacher (who,) after  
describing Heaven in alluring and golden terms, asked her  
class of small boys how many of them wanted to go to  
Heaven. With eyes that sparkled at the thought every  
small boy in the class held up his hand -- except one.  
Teacher said, "Why Charlie, Charlie McNary" (laughter)  
"Charlie, you don't want to go to Heaven? Why not?"  
"Teacher," he said, -- "sure I want to go to Heaven, but"  
he said, pointing to the rest of the boys in the room --  
"not with (that) this bunch". (Laughter)

A week ago, Homer Cummings invited three dis-  
tinguished leaders of the opposition (were invited) to  
come to this (great) Banquet -- a \$10.00 dinner with all  
the fixin's free -- no cover charge -- no \$100 check --  
no tips -- "nothin' to sign and nothin' to jine" -- and  
a free ring-side seat at a non-political plate-side chat.  
(Laughter) Believe-it-or-not -- they sent polite regrets.  
And why? (Applause)

You know, there are a lot of riddles in the National Capital. I, myself, am supposed to be a self-made riddle (laughter) -- in fact a sort of a cross between a riddle and a Santa Claus. Most of the riddles in this town, however, are the ones posed for you in some solemn column. Like cross-word puzzles and hypothetical bridge hands, they come to you morning or evening as a synthetic daily amusement feature, like fairy tales or bedtime stories calculated to keep unsuspecting children awake all night. But occasionally we get a real riddle like this one about the three empty chairs. (Laughter)

Why didn't our guests come? (Laughter) And I guess the real reason is that, like the small boy, they did not want to go to Heaven with this bunch. (Laughter)

But maybe there were -- maybe there were other reasons. Maybe it was because they figured that we just wanted to fatten up the ducks, and that we were putting on a closed season in January merely in order to get better sport next Fall. (Laughter)

Maybe they were holding out for an old-fashioned Jackson dinner. Someone called my attention the other day to a magazine article setting forth a report of a dinner in February, 1834 in Andrew Jackson's (White) House at that time Andrew Jackson's White House, a report that was made by a guest at the dinner. And I think it

would be interesting to you if I quote from a letter that this man who attended it sent home. (as made by a guest at the dinner. I quote:)

"The first course was soup in the French style; then beef bouillé, next wild turkey boned and dressed with brains;" I always thought, of course, that the Brain Trust was something new. But it isn't. (Laughter) Then "after that fish; then chicken cold and dressed white, interladed with slices of tongue and garnished with dressed salled; then canvass back ducks and celery; afterwards partridges with sweet breads and last pheasants and old Virginia ham. The dishes were placed in succession on the table, so as to give full effect to the appearance, then removed and carved on a side table by the servants. The first dessert was jelley and small tarts in the Turkish (style)" manner, "then blanche mode and kisses with dried fruits in them. Then preserves of various kinds," and "after them ice cream and lastly grapes and oranges."

Such a dinner today would cost the full \$100.00 that we have each and all of us paid; and there would have been nothing left for Jim Farley; and I am afraid that the Democratic Committee would have had to borrow money to provide bicarbonate of soda for all. (Laughter)

I had hoped that our invited guests would come because I had intended to tell them not only about Andrew Jackson but about Abraham Lincoln as well; to tell them how much alike all of our great leaders have been -- even to give them free -- though unsolicited -- advice (on) as to how to reconstitute the Republican Party successfully along the lines on which Abraham Lincoln created it. As the leader of the Democratic Party I (felt) feel no reluctance to give them good advice for I (was) feel sure that they would not use it -- they of little faith.



Seriously, the more I have studied American history and the more clearly I have seen what the problems are, I do believe that the common denominator of our great men in public life has not been mere allegiance to one political party, but the disinterested devotion with which they have tried to serve the whole country, and the relative unimportance that they have ascribed to politics, compared with the paramount importance of government.

By their motives may ye know them!

The relative importance of politics and government is something not always easy to see when you are in the frontline trenches of political organization.

In a period of thirty years, during which I have been more or less in public life -- in my home county, in Albany, in Washington, in Europe during the World War, in New York City, in national conventions, back in Albany and (finally) then again in Washington -- I have come to the conclusion that the closer people are to what may be called the frontlines of government, of all kinds -- local and state and federal -- the easier it is to see the immediate underbrush, the individual tree trunks of the moment and to forget the nobility, the usefulness and the wide extent of the forest itself.

It is because party people in County Court Houses or City Halls, or State Capitals, or the District of Columbia, are, most of them, so close to the picture of party



or factional warfare, that they are apt to acquire a false perspective of what the "motives" and the purposes of both parties and their leaders should be for the common good today.

They forget that politics, after all, is only an instrument through which to achieve government. They forget that back of the jockeying for party position -- back of the party generals -- hundreds of thousands of men and women -- the officers and the privates, the foremen and the workmen -- have got to get a good job done, have to put in day after day of honest, sincere work in carrying out the multitudinous functions that the policy-makers in modern democracy assign to administrators in modern democracy.

People tell me that I hold to party ties less tenaciously than (most) some of my predecessors in the Presidency, and that I, too, I have too many people in my Administration who are not active party Democrats. And I think I must admit the soft impeachment. My answer is that I do believe in party organization, but only in proportion to its proper place in Government. I believe party organization -- the existence of at least two effectively opposing parties -- is a sound and necessary part of our American system; and that, effectively organized nationally and by states and by localities, parties are good instruments for the purpose of presenting and

explaining issues, of drumming up interest in elections, and, incidentally, of improving the breed of candidates for public office.

But the future lies with those wise political leaders who realize that the great public is interested more in government than in politics; that the independent vote in this country has been steadily on the increase, at least for the past generation; that vast numbers of people consider themselves normally adherents of one party and still feel perfectly free to vote for one or more candidates of another party, come election day, and on the other hand, sometimes uphold party principles even when precinct captains decide "to take a walk". (Laughter)

The growing independence of voters, after all, (has) that's been proved by the votes in every Presidential election since my childhood -- and the tendency, frankly, is on the increase. I am too modest, of course, to refer to (the most recent example -- the election of 1936.) certain recent elections. Party regulars who want to win must hold their allies and supporters among those independent voters. And do not let us forget it.

There are, of course, some citizens -- I hope a decreasing number -- with whom I find it difficult to talk rationally on (this) the subject of strict party voting. I have in mind, for example, some of my close friends (in the South,) down Georgia-way, who are under the impression

that they would be ostracized in society and in business if it were to appear publicly that they had ever voted for a Republican. And I also have in mind some very close friends in northern villages and counties who tell me, quite frankly, that though they would give anything in the world to be able to vote for me, a Democrat, it would hurt their influence and their social position in their own home town. (Laughter)

I have in mind the predicament of one of the ablest editors of a great paper today who sometime ago said to me, very frankly:

"I am really in complete sympathy with your program" Mr. President, "but" I "cannot say so publicly because, (Mr. President,) the readers and" the "advertisers of my paper are ninety per cent Republicans and I simply cannot afford to change its unalterable policy of traditional opposition to anything and everything that comes from Democratic sources. Of course," Mr. President, "you understand."

And might I add, that the President understood.

(Laughter)

Millions of unnecessary words and explanations and solemn comments are uttered and written, (year after year) year in and year out about the great men of American history -- written with ample quotations -- to prove what Jefferson or Hamilton, Jackson or Clay, Lincoln or Douglas, Cleveland or Blaine, Theodore Roosevelt or Bryan would have said or would have done about some specific modern problem(s) of government if they were alive today. The



purpose of all these comments is either to induce the party leaders of today blindly to follow the words of leaders of yesterday; or to justify public acts or policies of today by the utterances of the past, often tortured out of context. Yes, the devil can quote past statesmen as (well) readily as he can quote the Scriptures, in order to prove his purpose.

But most people, who are not on the actual firing line of the moment, have come to attach major importance only to the motives behind the leaders of the past. To them it matters, on the whole, very little what party label American statesmen bore, or what mistakes they made in the smaller things, so long as they did the big job that their times demanded be done.

Alexander Hamilton is a hero to me in spite of his position that the nation would be safer if our leaders were chosen exclusively from persons of higher education (and) or of substantial property ownership; he is a hero because he did the job which then had to be done -- to bring stability out of (a) the chaos of currency and banking difficulties. (Applause)

Thomas Jefferson is a hero to me despite the fact that, in the light of later knowledge, the theories of the French Revolutionists at times over-excited his practical judgment. He is a hero because, in his many-sided genius, he too did the big job (which) that then had



to be done -- to establish the new republic as a real democracy based on universal suffrage and the inalienable rights of (man) men, instead of a restricted suffrage in the hands of a small oligarchy. Jefferson realized that if the people were free to get and discuss all the facts, their composite judgment would be better than the judgment of a self-perpetuating few. And that is why I think of Jefferson as belonging to the rank and file of both major political parties today. (Applause)

I do not know which party Lincoln would belong to if he were alive in 1940 -- and I am not even concerned to speculate on it; a new party had to be created before he could be elected President. I am more interested in the fact that he did the big job which then had to be done -- to preserve the Union and make possible, at a later time, (a) the united country that we all live in today. His sympathies and his motives of championship of humanity itself have made him for all centuries to come the legitimate property of all parties -- of every man, and woman and child in every part of our land.

And I feel very much the same way about Andrew Jackson -- not Jackson the Democrat but Jackson the American, Jackson the American who did the big job of his day -- to save the economic democracy of the Union for its westward expansion into a great nation, strengthened in the ideals and in the practice of popular government.

I have always thought it a magnificent illustration of the public's instinct for the quality of a leader, that the people triumphantly reelected Jackson in spite of the fact that in the meantime, in his fight for economic democracy, Biddle and the Bank had sought to create an economic depression in order to ruin (him.) the President himself.

And of all (of) these great American figures, I like to think -- and I (know) believe I am right -- that their purposes, their objectives, and especially their motives, placed the good of the nation always ahead of the good of the party; (that) and while, properly, they used the mechanics of party organization (in many) in a thousand ways, they dropped mere partisanship when they considered partisanship to be different from the party -- not the party but the national interest. (it against the national interest)

As some of you know, I saw a good deal of the Governorship of New York long before I became Governor (of the State,) and I saw a good deal of the inside of the White House for many years before I occupied it. Many years ago it had become clear to me that, properly availed of, the Governorship -- any Governorship and the Presidency, instead of being merely a party headquarters, could become the most important clearing house for exchange of information and ideas, (and) of facts and ideals, affecting the general (public) welfare.

In practice, as you know, I have tried to follow (out) that concept. In the White House today we have built up a great mosaic, a mosaic of the state of the union from thousands of bits of information -- from one man or woman this thought; from another, data on some event; a scrap here perhaps and a scrap there; from every Congressional district in the Union; from rich and from poor; from enthusiast and from complainant; from liberal and from conservative; from Republic and from Democrat.

I like to think that most American Governors or Presidents have seen the same opportunity in their office, and that their motives have been primarily motives of service rather than of party or personal aggrandizement. (Applause)

Doubtless they have all of them been irked, irked by (the) commentators and the interpreters of the day who ascribed other motives to them. Doubtless after much experience in the public life of America, with its free speech and its free press, the irksomeness wore off. Doubtless, all of them wore hair shirts when they started but if they matured in public life most of them discarded those shirts in their earlier days. In other words, they had to drop their hair shirt or else lose their political shirts.

And when you have learned not to worry at all about all of these things, there is really a lot of fun



in this job.

For when you reach (that) the point of understanding, there is a deep satisfaction in pursuing the truth through the medley of information that reaches the White House, the over-statement, the half-truth, the glittering generality, the viewing-with-alarm, and, equally, the pointing-with-pride. There is practical satisfaction in sifting a tiny particle of truth from the mass of irrelevances in which it is hidden. And there is the philosopher's satisfaction of trying to fit(ting) that particle of truth into the general scheme of things that are good and things that are bad for the good of the people (of the nation) as a whole.

I said a moment ago that the measure of greatness of any party leadership of a country, is the measure in which it gets done in its time the big job that has to be done. By this test I do not think anyone can say that the many people and a great many of them, I am glad to say, are here tonight, - the many people in these last seven years who have given composite leadership have failed in their obligation. People cannot say that. Most of those who call for a wholly different type of leadership must admit the fairly constant progress of these years. And most of those who complain now, let us not forget, were the shouting optimists of 1929.

You know, I do not believe that the American



people who swallowed that canned optimism in 1929 will swallow canned pessimism in 1940 -- particularly if it comes out of the same can. (Applause)

(The people of the United States) For the people of this great country of ours recognize two facts today: The first is that the world outside our hemisphere is (in) really in bad shape. This is a matter not for pessimism or for optimism; it seems to me that it is a matter for realism. It is a fact -- a fact so big that few people have grasped its meaning -- a fact so big in its effect on the future of the world that all of our little partisan squabbles are (shameful) a bit drab in the light. (of it.)

And the second is that we have made great gains at home in our own economic prosperity and in the security of our individual citizens. These gains must not be chipped away; they must be only a foundation on which to build (further) greater gains.

Behind us lies accomplished a really big job. It was the creation out of the funk, the pure unadulterated funk of the early thirties, the creation of a new spirit with which we can now face the forties. (Applause)

A realistic, recent historian of our party has wisely concluded when he says, "We have the intelligence to define our troubles and the physical means with which to meet them. In the end, whether we make America a good or a bad country will depend on what we make, individually,

of ourselves." And "a selfish and greedy people cannot be free."

The enormous task which the Democratic Party has already performed in this generation has been to provide the energy and the confidence to steer government in the interest and under the direction of those of our people who do not want to be selfish and who do not want to be greedy.

And I am convinced that most people in the United States do have a sense - with a real feeling of pleasure in the moralities involved - that we have been moving forward these later years in at least the right direction.

They are really glad that on the whole the farmer is no longer an economic outcast and is getting better prices for his crops.

They are glad that we are slowly working out for labor greater privileges (with) and at the same time greater responsibilities.

They are glad that gamblers and speculators are no longer the most honored element in our economic life.

They are glad that certain opportunities for security, once only available to the rich, like old age insurance, are becoming available to the poor.

They are glad that we are beginning to conserve the natural resources of our soils, our rivers and our trees for the good of our children; that we have improved

our roads and added to our parks and built hundreds of schools; that we are bringing to every housewife cheap electricity's relief from drudgery; that we have made our banks safe and brought our courts up to date; and last but not least, that we have kept millions of people out of the breadlines. (Applause)

Yes, they are glad that Government, the United States Government -- think what that means -- the Government of the United States, they are glad that it is daily becoming more useful, more honest and more decent.

And one of the manifestations of that new spirit is that there are fewer Americans who view with alarm. There are, of course, some people -- in addition to the (professional) political viewers-with-alarm -- who always look on the dark side of life. There are some who complain that things are not as they were once and who firmly believe that everybody who disagrees with them is a moron or a crook. They belong, it seems to me, to the type of unfortunate individual -- and almost every family has one of them -- the unfortunate individual of whom it is said "he is enjoying bad health." (Laughter)

Sometimes when I listen and listen to people like that I can better understand old Uncle Jed.

"Uncle Jed", said Ezra, one day, "Ben't you gittin' a leetle hard of hearin'?" "Yes", said Uncle Jed, "I'm afeared I'm gittin' a mite deaf."



Whereupon Ezra made Uncle Jed go down to Boston, go down to Boston to see an ear doctor.

Uncle Jed (returned) came back. And Ezra asked what happened. "Well", said Uncle Jed, "that doctor asked me if I had been drinkin' any. And I said 'Yes, I been drinkin' a mite'.

"And then that doctor said, 'Well, Jed, I might just as well tell you now that if you don't want to lose your hearin' you've got to give up drinkin'.'

"Well," said Uncle Jed "I thought it (all) over; and then I said, 'Doc, I like what I('ve) been drinkin' so much better than what I've been a-hearin', (laughter) that I reckon I'll jest keep on gittin' deaf! '" (Laughter - cheers - applause)

So you see I have talked with you tonight in a vein of old-fashioned country philosophy, with little or no partisanship mixed up with it, even though I think you will know how to apply some of these stories, little or no partisanship -- just as I promised my three Republican leader friends who ought to have been here tonight. They are grand fellows, liked by me and by every Democrat in the Congress. Nowadays most everybody in the country knows, by this time that sometimes when two Congressmen or two Senators engage in a terrific battle of words, a forensic philippic, a fifteen round heavyweight championship bout, the two contestants, five minutes later, will be found



sitting in the cloakroom with their arms about each other laughing and joking while they catch their breath. (Laughter)

There are, of course, a few exceptions, a few exceptions of men who, stretching political disagreements into personal invective, prove the general rule -- but why bring up unpleasant subjects at this dinner at which we are all having such a good time. I am genuinely sorry for those exceptions to the rule. They must find it mighty hard to live with themselves -- and with their families and their friends as well.

Yes, motive, motive in the long run is what counts -- motive incidentally accompanied by good manners. If leaders have good motives and good manners and, at the same time, knowledge, intimate knowledge of the different parts of the country and plenty of experience, you can be fairly safe in assuming that they won't wreck your Government.

But remember, my friends, that they must have other qualities too -- the willingness, the willingness to pay \$100 for a \$10.00 dinner, the fortitude to eat the whole of it, and the courage, the sublime courage to make a half-hour plate-side chat at the end of it. (Applause)

As actually delivered by the President.

Address Delivered by the President  
At the Graduation Exercises of the University of Virginia  
Charlottesville, Virginia, June 10, 1940

1499

PRESIDENT NEWCOMB, MY FRIENDS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA:

I notice by the program that I am asked to address the classes of 1940. I avail myself of that privilege but I also take this very apt occasion to speak to many other classes, classes that have graduated through all the years, classes that are still in the period of study, classes not alone of the schools of learning of the Nation but classes that have come up through the great schools of experience; in other words a cross section, a cross section just as you who graduate today are a cross section of the Nation as a whole.

Every generation of young men and women in America has questions to ask the world. Most of the time they are the simple but nevertheless difficult questions, questions of work to do, opportunities to find, ambitions to satisfy.

But every now and again in the history of the Republic a different kind of question presents itself -- a question that asks, not about the future of an individual or even of a generation, but about the future of the country, the future of the American people.

There was such a time at the beginning of our history - at the beginning of our history as a nation. Young people asked themselves in those days what lay ahead, not for themselves, but for the new United States.

There was such a time again in the seemingly endless years of the War Between the States. Young men and young women on both sides of the line asked themselves, not what trades or professions they would enter, what lives they would make, but what was to become of the country they had known.

There is such a time again today. Again today the young men and the young women of America ask themselves with earnestness and with deep concern this same question: "What is to become of the country we know."

Now they ask it with even greater anxiety than before. They ask, not only what the future holds for this Republic, but what the future holds for all peoples and all nations that have been living under democratic forms of government, - under the free institutions of a free people.

It is understandable to all of us, I think, that they should ask this question. They read the words of those who are telling them that the ideal of individual liberty, the ideal of free franchise, the ideal of peace through justice is a decadent ideal. They read the word and hear the boast of those who say that a belief in force - force directed by self-chosen leaders - is the new and vigorous system which will overrun the earth. They have seen the ascendancy of this philosophy of force in nation after nation where free institutions and individual liberties were once maintained.

It is natural and understandable that the younger generation should first ask itself what the extension of the philosophy of force to all the world would lead to ultimately. We see today, for example, in stark reality some of the consequences of what we call the machine age.

Where control of machines has been retained in the hands of mankind as a whole, untold benefits have accrued to mankind. For mankind was then the master; and the machine was the servant.

But, in this new system of force the mastery of the machine is not in the hands of mankind. It is in the control of infinitely small groups of individuals who rule without a single one of the democratic sanctions that we have known. The machine in hands of irresponsible conquerors becomes the master; mankind is not only the servant; it is the victim too. Such mastery abandons with deliberate contempt all of the



moral values to which even this young country for more than three hundred years has been accustomed and dedicated.

Surely the new philosophy proves from month to month that it could have no possible conception of the way of life or the way of thought of a nation whose origins go back to Jamestown and Plymouth Rock.

And conversely, neither those who spring from that ancient stock nor those who have come hither in later years can be indifferent to the destruction of freedom in their ancestral lands across the sea.

Perception of danger, danger to our institutions may come slowly or it may come with a rush and a shock as it has to the people of the United States in the past few months. This perception of danger, danger in a worldwide area - it has come to us clearly and overwhelmingly - we perceive the peril in a world-wide arena, an arena that may become so narrowed that only the Americas will retain the ancient faiths.

Some indeed still hold to the now somewhat obvious delusion that we of the United States can safely permit the United States to become a lone island, a lone island in a world dominated by the philosophy of force.

Such an island may be the dream of those who still talk and vote as isolationists. Such an island represents to me and to the overwhelming majority of Americans today a helpless nightmare, the helpless nightmare of a people without freedom; yes, the nightmare of a people lodged in prison, handcuffed, hungry, and fed through the bars from day to day by the contemptuous, unpitying masters of other continents.

It is natural also that we should ask ourselves how now we can prevent the building of that prison and the placing of ourselves in the midst of it.

Let us not hesitate -- all of us -- to proclaim certain truths. Overwhelmingly we, as a nation - and this applies to all the other American nations - are convinced that military and naval victory for the gods of force and hate would endanger the institutions of democracy in the western world, and that equally, therefore, the whole of our sympathies lies with those nations that are giving their life blood in combat against these forces.

The people and the Government of the United States have seen with the utmost regret and with grave disquiet the decision of the Italian Government to engage in the hostilities now raging in Europe.

More than three months ago the Chief of the Italian Government sent me word that because of the determination of Italy to limit, so far as might be possible, the spread of the European conflict, more than two hundred millions of people in the region of the Mediterranean had been enabled to escape the suffering and the devastation of war.

I informed the Chief of the Italian Government that this desire on the part of Italy to prevent the war from spreading met with full sympathy and response on the part of the Government and the people of the United States, and I expressed the earnest hope of this Government and of this people that this policy on the part of Italy might be continued. I made it clear that in the opinion of the Government of the United States any extension of hostilities in the region of the Mediterranean might result in a still greater enlargement of the scene of the conflict, the conflict in the Near East and in Africa and that if this came to pass no one could foretell how much greater the theater of the war eventually might become.

Again on a subsequent occasion, not so long ago, recognizing that certain aspirations of Italy might form the basis of discussions between the powers most specifically concerned, I offered, in a message addressed to the Chief of the Italian Government, to send to the Governments of France and of



Great Britain such specific indications of the desires of Italy to obtain readjustments with regard to her position as the Chief of the Italian Government might desire to transmit through me. While making it clear that the Government of the United States in such an event could not and would not assume responsibility for the nature of the proposals submitted nor for agreements which might thereafter be reached, I proposed that if Italy would refrain from entering the war I would be willing to ask assurances from the other powers concerned that they would faithfully execute any agreement so reached and that Italy's voice in any future peace conference would have the same authority as if Italy had actually taken part in the war, as a belligerent.

Unfortunately, unfortunately to the regret of all of us and to the regret of humanity, the Chief of the Italian Government was unwilling to accept the procedure suggested and he has made no counter proposal.

This Government directed its efforts to doing what it could to work for the preservation of peace in the Mediterranean area, and it likewise expressed its willingness to endeavor to cooperate with the Government of Italy when the appropriate occasion arose for the creation of a more stable world order, through the reduction of armaments, and through the construction of a more liberal international economic system which would assure to all powers equality of opportunity in the world's markets and in the securing of raw materials on equal terms.

I have likewise, of course, felt it necessary in my communications to Signor Mussolini to express the concern of the Government of the United States because of the fact that any extension of the war in the region of the Mediterranean would inevitably result in great prejudice to the ways of life and government and to the trade and commerce of all of the American Republics.

The Government of Italy has now chosen to preserve what it terms its "freedom of action" and to fulfill what it states are its promises to Germany. In so doing it has manifested disregard for the rights and security of other nations, disregard for the lives of the peoples of those nations which are directly threatened by this spread of the war; and has evidenced its unwillingness to find the means through pacific negotiations for the satisfaction of what it believes are its legitimate aspirations.

On this tenth day of June, 1940, the hand that held the dagger has struck it into the back of its neighbor.

On this tenth day of June, 1940, in this University founded by the first great American teacher of democracy, we send forth our prayers and our hopes to those beyond the seas who are maintaining with magnificent valor their battle for freedom.

In our, in our unity, in our American unity, we will pursue two obvious and simultaneous courses; we will extend to the opponents of force the material resources of this nation and, at the same time, we will harness and speed up the use of those resources in order that we ourselves in the Americas may have equipment and training equal to the task of any emergency and every defense.

All roads leading to the accomplishment of these objectives must be kept clear of obstructions. We will not slow down or detour. Signs and signals call for speed -- full speed ahead.

Yes, it is right that each new generation should ask questions. But in recent months the principal question has been somewhat simplified. Once more the future of the nation, the future of the American people is at stake.

We need not and we will not, in any way, abandon our continuing effort to make democracy work within our borders. Yes, we still insist on the need for vast improvements in our own social and economic life.



But that, that is a component part of national defense itself.

The program unfolds swiftly and into that program will fit the responsibility and the opportunity of every man and woman in the land to preserve his and her heritage in days of peril.

I call for effort, courage, sacrifice, devotion. Granting the love of freedom, all of these are possible.

And, -- and the love of freedom is still fierco, still steady in the nation today.

- - - - -

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
Convention Hall, Philadelphia  
October 23, 1940, 9.15 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN, MY FRIENDS OF PHILADELPHIA:

This is almost like a convention. (Applause)

Last July I stated (the) a plain obvious fact, a fact which I told to the national convention of my party: that the pressure of national defense work and the conduct of (foreign) national affairs would not allow me to conduct any campaign in the accepted definition of that term.

Since July, hardly a day or a night has passed when some crisis, or some possibility of a crisis in world affairs, has not called for my personal conference with (the) our great Secretary of State (or) and with other officials of (the) your Government.

With every passing day has come some urgent problem in connection with our swift production for defense, and our mustering of the resources of the nation.

Therefore, it is essential, I have found it very essential in the national interest, to adhere to the rule never to be more than twelve hours distant from (Washington) our National Capital.

But last July I also said to this (to the) Chicago Convention: "I shall never be loath to call the attention of the nation to deliberate or unwitting falsifications of fact, which are sometimes made by political candidates." (Applause)

The time has come for me to do just that. (Applause)

This night and four other nights I am taking time to point out to the American people what the more fantastic misstatements of

this campaign have been. I emphasize the words "more fantastic," because it would take three hundred and sixty-five nights to discuss all of them. (Applause)

And, incidentally, all of these misstatements cannot possibly be what I called last July, "unwitting falsifications" of fact; many of them must be and are "deliberate falsifications" of fact. (Applause)

The young people who are attending dinners in every state of the Union tonight know that they are already a part of the whole economic and social life of the nation. And I am particularly glad to discuss with them -- and with you -- these misstatements and the facts which refute them.

Truthful campaign discussion of public issues is essential to the American form of government; but wilful misrepresentation of fact has no place either during election time or at any other time. (Applause) For example, there can be no objection to any party or any candidate urging that the undeveloped water power of this nation should be harnessed by private utility companies rather than by the Government itself; or that the social security law should be repealed, or that the truth-in-securities act should be abrogated.

But it is an entirely (a) different thing for any party or any candidate to state, for example, that the President of the United States telephoned to Mussolini and Hitler to sell Czechoslovakia down the river; (boos - applause) or to state that the unfortunate unemployed of the nation are going to be driven into concentration camps; (boos) or that the social security funds of the (nation) Government of the United States will not be in existence when the workers of

today become old enough to apply for them; (boos) or that the election of the present Government means the end of American democracy within four years. (Boos) I think they know, and I know we know that all of (these) those statements are false. (Applause)

Now, certain techniques of propaganda, created and developed in dictator countries have been imported into this campaign. It is the very simple technique of repeating and repeating and repeating falsehoods, with the idea that by constant repetition and reiteration, with no contradiction, the misstatements will finally come to be believed.

Dictators have had great success in using this technique; but only because they were able to control the press and the radio, and to stifle all opposition. That is why I cannot bring myself to believe that in a democracy like ours, where the radio and a part of the press (applause and laughter) -- I repeat, where the radio and a part of the press (pointing to where the Press were seated) remain open to both sides, repetition of deliberate misstatements in our democracy will (ever) never prevail.

I make the charge now that these falsifications are being spread for the purpose of filling the minds and the hearts of the American people with fear. They are used to create fear by instilling in the minds of (the) our people doubt of each other, doubt of their Government, and doubt of the purposes of their democracy.

This type of campaign has a familiar ring. It reminds us of the scarecrow of (1936) four years ago, the scarecrow that the social security funds were going to be diverted from the pockets of



the American working man.

It reminds us of the scarecrow, the famous old scarecrow of 1932 (boos), that scarecrow, and I quote, "that grass will grow in the streets of a hundred cities; (applause and boos) a thousand towns; that the weeds will overrun the fields of millions of farms."

No, the American people will not be stampeded into panic. The effort failed before and it will fail again. (Applause) (They) The overwhelming majority of Americans will not be scared by this blitzkrieg of verbal incendiary bombs. They are now calmly aware that, once more, "the only thing we have to fear is fear itself." (Applause)

I consider it a public duty to answer falsifications with facts. I will not pretend that I find this an unpleasant duty. (Applause) I am an old campaigner, and I love a good fight. (Applause)

My friends, the Presidency is not a prize to be won by mere glittering promises. It is not a commodity to be sold by high-pressure salesmanship and national advertising. (Applause) The Presidency is a most sacred trust and it ought not to be dealt with on any level other than an appeal to reason and (to) humanity. (Applause)

Let us get on. The worst bombshell of fear which the Republican leaders have let loose on this people is the accusation that this Government of ours, a Government of Republicans and Democrats alike, without the knowledge of the Congress or of the people, has secretly entered into agreements with foreign nations. They even intimate that such commitments have endangered the security of the

United States, or are about to endanger it, or have pledged in some way the participation of the United States in some foreign war. It seems almost unnecessary to deny such a charge. But so long as the fantastic misstatement has been made, I must brand it for what it is.

I give to you and to the people of this country this most solemn assurance: There is no secret treaty, no secret obligation, no secret commitment, no secret understanding in any shape or form, direct or indirect, with any other government, or any other nation in any part of the world (applause), (to) no such secrecy that might or could in any shape involve this nation in any war or for any other purpose. Is that clear? (Applause)

The desperation of partisans who can invent secret treaties drives them to try to deceive our people in other ways. Consider, for example, the false charge they make that our whole industrial system is prostrate -- that business is stifled, (and) that business can make no profits.

The American people have not forgotten the condition of the United States in 1932. (Boos and applause) We all remember the failures of the banks, the bread lines of starving men and women, the youth of the country riding around in freight cars, the farm foreclosures, the home foreclosures, the bankruptcy and the panic. (Applause)

And what happened? At the very hour of complete collapse, the American people called for new leadership. That leadership, this Administration and a Democratic Congress supplied. (Applause)

Government, no longer callous to suffering, moved swiftly to end distress, to halt depression, to secure more social and economic justice for all.

The very same men who must bear the responsibility for the inaction of those days are the ones who now dare falsely to state that we are all still in the depth of the depression into which they plunged us; (applause) that we have prevented the country from recovering, and that it is headed for the chaos of bankruptcy. They have even gone to the extent of stating that this Administration has not made one man a job.

I say that those statements are false. (Applause) I say that the figures of employment, of production, of earnings, of general business activity -- all prove that they are false. (Applause)

The tears, the crocodile tears, the tears for the laboring man and laboring woman now being shed in this campaign come from those same Republican leaders who had their chance to prove their love for labor in 1932 -- and missed it. (Applause)

Yes, back in 1932, (these) those leaders were willing to let the workers starve if they could not get a job.

Back in 1932, they were not willing to guarantee collective bargaining.

Back in 1932, they met the demands of unemployed veterans with (fire and) troops and tanks. (Applause)

Back in 1932, they raised their hands in horror at the thought of fixing a minimum wage or maximum hours for labor; (applause) they never gave one thought to such things as pensions for old age or insurance for the unemployed. (Applause)

And in 1940, eight years later, what a different tune is played by them! (Laughter) It is a tune played against a sounding board of election day. It is a tune with overtones which whisper:



Votes, votes, votes." (Applause)

Yes, these same Republican leaders are (for) all for the new progressive measures now; they believe in them. (Laughter) They believe in them so much that they will never be happy until they can clasp them to their own chests and put their own brand upon them. (Laughter) Yes, if they could only get control of them, they plead, they would take so much better care of them, honest-to-goodness they would. (Laughter and applause)

This tune is, of course, only a rehash of the tune of 1936, but a little louder. In that election year the affection of these Republican leaders for the laboring man also rose to a high pitch. But after election day they and their friends did all (that) they could in the Congress of the United States, before departments and administrative bodies, and in the courts, and in the press, to beat (these measures) down these measures, beat them down into the ground. (Applause)

What are the plain facts about employment today?

There are nine million more men and women employed in private industry now, private industry, than were employed in March of 1933. (Applause)

In the month of August of this year, 1940, over four hundred thousand were added to the (private) payrolls. And last month, (In) September, another five hundred thousand workers went to work in our industries. (Applause)

The millions that have gone to work, and the other hundreds of thousands now going to work each month in private industry, they are the unequivocal answer to the brazen statement made by the Repub-



licans in this campaign, that this Administration has not added one private job since 1933. (Boos) (This) That statement of theirs can only be branded as a deliberate misstatement of fact. And I now so brand it. (Applause)

Let us call the roll of some of the specific improvements in the lot of the working men and women that have come about during the past eight years.

More than forty-two million American employees are now members of the old-age pension system. (Applause) And an additional two million men and women, over sixty-five years of age, are now receiving cash grants each month. (Applause)

Twenty-nine million American employees have been brought under the protection of unemployment insurance. (Applause)

Collective bargaining has been guaranteed. (Applause)

A minimum wage has been established. (Applause)

A maximum work week of forty hours has been fixed, with provision for time-and-a-half for overtime. (Applause)

And last, but by no means least, child labor has been outlawed. (Applause)

The average hourly earnings of factory workers were fifty-six cents in the boom year of 1929. (In) By February, 1933, -- before I went to Washington -- they had dropped to forty-five cents an hour. They are now sixty-seven cents an hour -- not only higher than in 1933, but, mark you, nearly eleven cents (per) an hour higher than in 1929 itself. (Applause)

Factory pay envelopes -- most of you get them -- had fallen to five billion dollars (per) a year by 1932. (In) By 1940, factory

payrolls are running at the rate of twice as much, of ten billion dollars.

And, something else, we must not forget that the cost of living (is) today is twenty-two per cent lower than it was in 1929. (Applause) And that means something to the average American family. (Applause)

An equally unpardonable falsification about our economy is made when (the) Republican leaders talk about American business -- how (it) American business cannot make a profit, how little confidence it has in this Administration, and how this Administration hates business. (Laughter)

We know, if we but look at the record, that American business, big and small business, is way up above the level of 1932, and on a much sounder footing than it was even in the twenties.

Do you need figures to prove it? Just a few:

Our national income has nearly doubled since 1932, from thirty-nine billions up to the rate of seventy-four billions in 1940. (Applause) And if you properly consider the lower cost of living today than in 1929, the national income is even higher now than in (the) that great boom year (of 1929).

In the ten years before (the) that crash of (19)'29, the years of the so-called prosperity boom, bank failures averaged over six hundred a year. The number of bank failures last year was only forty-two and of those forty-two, thirty-two were not under federal deposit insurance. Ten were. (Ten of these) Those ten were under federal deposit insurance set up by this Administration, (and) in those ten banks, ninety-nine per cent of the depositors did not lose

(a) one dollar. (Applause)

During this Administration the total number of bank failures for the entire seven years was less than the number of bank failures in any single (one) year of the preceding ten years. (Applause)

(And yet there are some banks now) It is a funny world!

(Laughter) You know, there are some banks now using money to advertise, or to send letters to their depositors, hinting that unless this Administration is defeated, the deposits of their banks will be in danger. (This) That is sheer intimidation, intimidation to blackmail the election, and to return the financial control of the Government to the very forces which had nearly wrecked the nation. (Applause)

And now as to corporation profits. They were a minus quantity in 1932. Corporations as a whole showed losses of almost four billion dollars that year. By now, eight years later, that deficit has been not only wiped out, (and) but corporations are reporting profits of four billion dollars a year. (Applause)

And yet they say this Administration prevents profits and stifles business. (Laughter)

If it is true that the New Deal is the enemy of business, and that the Republican leaders, who brought business to the brink of ruin in 1932, are the friends of business -- then I can only say that American business should continue to be saved from its friends.

(Laughter -- applause)

Why, the output of our factories and mines is now almost thirteen per cent greater than at the peak of (19)'29 -- 1929, mind you, not (19)'32. It is at the highest level ever (recorded) reached.



We (have) passed the time when the prosperity of the nation is measured in terms of the stock ticker. We know that the well-being of a people is measured by the manner in which they live, by the security which they feel in their (the) future. (Applause)

For the American people as a whole -- the great body of its citizens -- the standard of living has increased well above that of 1929.

We do not advertise "a chicken in every pot" (laughter) or even "two cars in every garage." (Laughter) We know that it is more important that the American people this year are building more homes, are buying more pairs of shoes, more washing machines, more electric refrigerators, more (electric) current, more textile (applause) products than in (the boom year of) 1929. (Applause)

Yes, this year there (will be) is being placed on the tables of America (far) more butter, more cheese, more meat, more canned goods -- more food in general than in (the) that luxurious year of 1929. (Applause)

Last Sunday morning I had (to) a good laugh. I had a good laugh when I read the following in the financial section of the New York Times -- a paper which is reputed not to love me too much.

(Laughter) And this is what (an editor) a writer of the financial page of the New York Times said: I quote, "The Federal Reserve Board in the week added another point to its index of production for September, and the figure now stands at (one) a hundred and twenty-five, or thirteen and a half per cent above the 1929 average" -- mind you, not the (19)'32 average but the 1929 average. I quote further: "Dreams of business 'flat on its back' must come from smoking campaign cigars



(laughter) or else the speakers are talking about some other country."

(Laughter)

Now, wouldn't it be nice if the editorial writers of the New York Times could get acquainted with their own business experts?

(Laughter - applause)

Every single man, woman and child has a vital interest in this recovery. But if it can be said to affect any single group more than any other, that group would be the young men and women of America.

It may be hard for some of you younger people to remember the dismal kind of world which the youth of America faced in (19)'32.

The tragedy of those days has passed. There is today in the youth of the nation a new spirit, a new energy, a new conviction that a sounder and more stable economy is being built for them.

In 1940 this generation of American youth can truly feel that they have a real stake in (their country) the United States.

(Applause)

Through (the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration) many Government agencies these millions of youth have benefited by training, (and) by education, and by jobs.

(Applause)

And we propose in the interests of justice and in the interests of national defense too, to broaden the work and extend the benefits of both these agencies. For they are a part of the lines of defense (behind the first lines) -- training men and women for essential defense industries and for other industries; educating them to self-reliance -- to moral resistance against that way of life (which) that ignores the individual.

The one thing which must be extended if we would help the young men and women of the nation, is to give them the opportunity to work.

We have recognized that to the right to vote, the right to learn, the right to speak, the right to worship, we, (your) the Government of the United States adds the right to work. (Applause)

We have that definite goal toward which we are aiming. We believe that if our boys or girls on reaching employment age have been unable to get a job in private industry, the Government owes them the duty of furnishing them with the necessary training to equip them for employment. (Applause) And we are determined during the next four years to make that our objective (applause) -- to make work for every young man and woman in America a living fact. (Applause)

Tonight there is one more false charge -- one outrageously false charge -- that has been made to strike terror into the hearts of our citizens. It is a charge that offends every political and religious conviction that I hold dear. It is the charge that this Administration wishes to lead this country into war.

(This) That charge is contrary to every fact, every purpose of the past eight years. Throughout these years my every act and (every) thought has been directed to the end of preserving the peace of the world, and more particularly, the peace of the United States -- the peace of the Western Hemisphere. (Applause)

As I saw the war coming, I used every ounce of the prestige of the office of the President of the United States to prevent its onset.

When war came, I used every ounce of the prestige of the

office to prevent its spread to other nations. When (that) the effort failed, I called upon the Congress, and I called upon the nation, to build the strong defenses that would be our best guarantee of peace and security in (this) the American Hemisphere. (Applause)

To Republicans and Democrats, to every man, woman and child in the nation I say this: Your President and your (great) Secretary of State are following the road to peace. (Applause)

We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war.

We are arming ourselves not for any purpose(s) of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the Platform of our Party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack." (Prolonged applause)

It is for peace that I have labored; and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life. (Prolonged applause and cheers)

\* \* \* \* \*



ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT  
Madison Square Garden, New York  
October 28, 1940, 10.00 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN, GOVERNOR LEHMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

No campaign can possibly be complete without this great Garden meeting. (Applause)

I have had a very wonderful day in New York, all five boroughs. But, as you know, I have had an anxious day too because three or four times during the day I have had to be in touch with the Department of State, with the Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, (applause) because, unfortunately, it seems that another war has broken out on the other side of the ocean, and I am quite sure that all of you will feel the same sorrow in your hearts that I feel -- the sorrow in our hearts for the Italian people and the Grecian people, that they should have been involved together in conflict.

Tonight it is the second time I take up (again) once more the public duty -- the far from disagreeable duty -- of answering major campaign falsifications with facts. (Applause)

Last week in Philadelphia, which is supposed to be the City of Brotherly Love, but isn't always -- I nailed the falsehood about some fanciful secret treaties, I nailed them up to dry on the barn door. (Laughter) I nailed that falsehood and other falsehoods the way when I was a boy up in Dutchess County we used to nail up the skins of foxes and weasels. (Laughter) And I think it was a kinsman of mine, about thirty years ago, who invented the word, "weasel words."

Tonight I am going to nail up the falsifications that have



to do with our relations with the rest of the world, (and) with the building up of our Army, our Navy and our air defense. It's (is) a very dangerous thing for the United States to distort facts about (such) things (.) like that, because (If) if repeated over and over again, it is (also) apt to create a sense of fear (and) a sense of doubt in the minds of some (of the) American people.

And so I now brand as false the statement being made by Republican campaign orators (boos), day after day and night after night, that the rearming of America was slow, that it is hamstrung and impeded, that it will never be able to meet threats from abroad. Those are the whisperings of appeasers.

That particular misstatement (was invented) has a history. It came into the world last June, just about the time of the Republican National Convention. (Laughter) Before that, the responsible Republican leaders had been singing an entirely different song. For almost seven years the Republican leaders in the Congress kept on saying that I was placing too much emphasis on national defense. (Applause)

And now today these men of great vision, they have suddenly discovered that there is a war/going on in Europe and another one in Asia. And so, now, always with their eyes on the good old ballot box, they are charging that we have placed too little emphasis on national defense.

But, unlike them, the printed pages of the Congressional Record cannot be changed or suppressed at election time. (Applause) And based on that permanent record of their speeches and their votes, I make this assertion -- that if the Republican leaders had been in

control of the Congress of the United States during the past seven years, the important measures for our defenses would not now be law; (and) I make the assertion that the Army and Navy of the United States would still be in almost the same condition in which I found them in 1933. (Applause)

Remember, I am (make) making (these) those charges against the responsible political leadership of the Republican Party. But there are millions -- millions and millions -- of patriotic Republicans who have at all times been in sympathy with the efforts of this Administration to arm itself adequately for purposes of defense. (Applause)

And to Washington in the past few months have come not two or three or a dozen but several hundred of the best business executives in the United States -- Republicans and Democrats alike. Not holding company (lawyers or) executives or lawyers, (but) I am talking about men experienced in actual production -- production of all the types of machines and tools and steel and everything else that have made this nation the industrial leader of the world.

Yes, I have asked Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Stettinius and Mr. Harriman and Mr. Budd and the many others to serve their Government because I certainly believe that they are (certainly) among the ablest men in the (country) nation in their own fields. (Applause) I do not know their politics. I do not care about their politics. (Applause) All I know is that they are cooperating one hundred per cent with this Administration in our efforts for national defense. (Applause) And, the other way around, this Government is cooperating with them -- one hundred per cent.

All of these men -- all of American industry and American labor -- they are all doing magnificent and unselfish work. And the progress of today proves it. (Applause)

I shall have occasion (in a later speech) on Wednesday or Friday or Saturday of this week to tell more about the work they are doing, that they are turning out, and about the progress (which) that has been made in our whole picture of defense.

When the World War, I mean the first World War (ended) broke out, we were pretty weak, but by the end of it we were the strongest, one of the strongest naval and military powers in the world. But when this Administration first came into office fifteen years later, we were one of the weakest.

As early as that year of 1933 the storm (was gathering) in Europe, was gathering and it was gathering in Asia. Year by year I reported the warnings of danger from our listening posts in foreign lands. But I was only called "an alarmist" by the Republican leadership, and by the great majority of the Republican (papers) newspapers of the country. (Boos)

Year by year I asked for more and more defense appropriations. In addition, I allocated hundreds of millions of dollars for defense work from relief funds, (from) the (Civilian Conservation Corps funds) U.C.C. helped, (and from Public Works funds) the Public Works helped -- as was understood by the Congress when the (funds were voted) money was voted by them.

Today our Navy is at a peak of efficiency and fighting strength. Ship for ship, (and) man for man, it is as powerful and efficient as any single navy that ever sailed the seas in (the) history.



(of the world) (Applause) But, it is not as powerful as combinations of other navies that might be put together in an attack upon us. Our Army and our air forces are now at the highest level that they have ever been in peacetime. But in the light of existing dangers they are not great enough for the absolute safety of America at home.

While this great, constructive work was going forward -- what happened? -- the Republican leaders were definitely and beyond peradventure of doubt trying to block our efforts toward national defense. They not only voted against these efforts; but they stated time and again through the years that they were unnecessary, (and) that they were extravagant, that our armed strength was sufficient for any emergency.

I propose now to indict these Republican leaders out of their own mouths (applause) -- these leaders who now disparage our defenses -- indict them with what they themselves said in the days before this election year, about how adequate our defenses already were.

Listen to this (statement) for instance: (I quote:)

"The facts are that we have (the largest and most powerful Navy we ever had, except for two years after the World War, and) the greatest air forces we ever had and a match for any nation."

Now, who do you (think) suppose made (this) that statement (in June 1938?) a little over two years ago? It was not I. It was not even a member of this Administration. It was the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Republican leader, Hamilton Fish. (Boos)

And now listen to the only living ex-President of the United States (Hoover speaking in that same year of 1939. I quote:). He said



in that same year, two years ago:

"We shall be expending nine hundred million dollars more than any other nation on earth,"

(he complained.)

"We are leading in the arms race."

And now listen to Republican leader Senator Vandenberg, (boos) also speaking (in 1938) at that time. He said that our defense expenditures had already (bought) brought us (and I quote) "an incomparably efficient Navy"; and he said further, "I rise in opposition to this super-super Navy bill. (Laughter) I do not believe it is justified by any conclusive demonstration of national necessity."

And (now) then listen to what Republican leader Senator Taft -- the runner-up (this year) for the Republican Presidential nomination this year, said: (speaking in February, 1940. I quote:) Why, just this past February, 1940, he said:

"The increase of the Army and Navy over the tremendous appropriations of the current year seems to be unnecessary if we are concerned solely with defense." (Laughter and applause)

There is the record on that; (there is) the permanent crystal clear record. Until the present political campaign opened, Republican leaders, in (Congress) and out of the Congress, shouted from the house-tops that our defenses were fully adequate.

Today they (complain) proclaim that this Administration has starved our armed forces, that our Navy is anemic, (laughter) our Army puny, (laughter) our air forces piteously weak.

(This) Yes, it is a remarkable somersault.

I wonder if the election could have something to do with it. (Laughter) And this seems what they would have called "logic" when I

was at school: If the Republican leaders were telling the truth in 1938 and 1939, then -- out of their own mouths -- they stand convicted of inconsistency today. (Applause) And, as we used to say, per contra, if they are (not) telling the truth today, (then) they stand convicted of inconsistency in 1938 (and 1939).

Why, the simple truth is that the Republican Party, through its leadership, played politics with defense, the defense of the United States, in 1938 and 1939. And they are playing politics with the national security of America today. (Applause)

(The) That same group (will) would still control their party (policy) in (the) Congress at the next session. It is the Congress (which) that passes the laws of the United States. The record of (these) those Republican leaders shows what a slim chance the cause of strong defense would have, if they were in control.

Not only in their statements but in their votes is written their record of sabotage of this Administration's continual efforts to increase our defenses to meet the dangers that loomed ever larger and larger upon the horizon.

For example, deeply concerned over what was happening in Europe, I asked the Congress in January, 1938, for a naval expansion of twenty per cent -- forty-six additional ships (and), nine hundred and fifty new planes.

What did the Republican leaders do when they had this chance to increase our national defense almost three years ago? You would think from their present barrage of verbal pyrotechnics, (laughter) that they rushed in to pass that bill, or that they even demanded a larger expansion (of) for the Navy.

But, ah! my friends, they were not in a national campaign for votes then. (Laughter)

In those days they were trying to build up a different kind of political fence.

In those days they thought that the way to win votes was by representing this Administration as extravagant in national defense, indeed as hysterical (and), as manufacturing panics and inventing foreign dangers.

But now, in the serious days of 1940, all is changed! Not only because they are serious days, but because they are election days as well. (Applause)

To use the old, old example that is always good: On the radio these Republican orators swing through the air with the greatest of ease; (laughter) but the American people are not voting this year for the best trapeze performer. (Laughter and applause)

The plain fact is that when (the) that naval (expansion) bill I was speaking about was submitted to the Congress, the Republican leaders jumped in to fight it.

Who were they? There was the present Republican candidate for Vice President, Senator McNary. (Boos) There were Senator Vandenberg and Senator Nye. And there was the man who would be the Chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congressman Fish. (Boos)

The first thing they did was to try to eliminate the battle-ships from the bill. The Republicans in the House voted sixty-seven to twenty against building them; and in the Senate, where the Republicans had a much smaller number, the Republicans voted seven to four



against building them.

The record is (certainly) perfectly clear that back in 1938 (the Republican leaders) they were positive in their own minds that we needed no more battleships. The naval expansion bill, of course, was passed; but it was passed by Democratic votes in the Congress -- in spite of the Republicans (opposition).

You see, I am talking by the book. Again, in March, 1939, the Republican Senators voted twelve to four against the bill for one hundred and two million dollars to buy certain strategic (defense) war materials (which) that we (did not) needed, that we do not have in (the United States) this country.

In March, 1939, the Republicans in the Senate voted eleven to eight against increasing the authorized number of planes in the Navy.

In June, 1939, Republicans in the House voted one hundred and forty-four to eight in favor of reducing the appropriations for the Army Air Corps. (Boos)

Now that proves this one simple fact: It proves that if the Republican leaders had been in control in the Congress in 1938 and 1939, these measures to increase our Navy and our Army and our air forces would have been defeated overwhelmingly.

I say that (the Republican) those leaders played politics with defense in 1938 and (1939.) I say that they are playing politics with our national security today.

(One more example:) Turn another page:

The Republican campaign orators and leaders are all now yelling "me too" (laughter)-- and especially I know in the past few



days they are saying "me too" on help to Britain. (Applause) But last fall, this fall, 1940, they had their chance to vote to give aid to Britain and other democracies -- and they turned it down.

This chance came when I recommended that the Congress repeal the embargo on the shipment of armaments and munitions to nations at war, and permit such shipment on a "cash-and-carry basis." (It is only because of the repeal of the embargo law that we have been able to sell planes and ships and guns and munitions to victims of aggression.)

But how did the Republicans vote on the repeal of (this) that embargo?

In the Senate the Republicans voted fourteen to six against it. And in the House, this time, the Republicans voted one hundred and forty to nineteen against it. (Boos)

Yes, the Act was passed by Democratic votes (applause) but it was over the opposition of the Republican leaders. And just to name a few, the following Republican leaders, among many others, voted against the Act -- Senators McNary, Vandenberg, Nye and Johnson; now wait, a perfectly beautiful alliteration -- Congressmen Martin, Barton and Fish. (Laughter and applause.)

Now, now, at the eleventh hour, they have discovered what we knew all along -- that overseas success in warding off invasion by dictatorship forces means safety (to) of the United States. (Applause) (as well as to those) It means also independence, continued independence, to those smaller nations which still retain their independence. (Applause) And it means (the) restoration of sovereignty to those smaller nations which have temporarily lost it. (Applause) As we

know, one of the keystones of American policy is the recognition of the right of small nations to survive and prosper. (Applause)

So, we can well say that (Great) Britain and a lot of other nations would never have received (an) one ounce of help from us -- if the decision had been left to Martin, Barton and Fish.

And, finally, let (us) me come down to (one more example -- which took place just) something that happened two months ago.

In the Senate there was an amendment to permit the United States Government to prevent profiteering or unpatriotic obstruction by any corporation in defense work. It permitted the Government to take over, with reasonable compensation, any manufacturing plant which refused to cooperate in national defense. (Applause) And the Republican Senators voted against this Russell-Overton Amendment on August 28, 1940, eight to six.

The bill was adopted all right -- by Democratic votes. (Applause) But the opposing vote of those eight Republican leaders showed what would happen if the National Government were turned over to their control. For their vote said, in effect, that they put money rights ahead of human lives -- to say nothing of national security.

You and I, and the overwhelming majority of Americans, will never stand for that. (Applause)

Let's go: Outside the halls of Congress eminent Republican candidates began to turn new somersaults. At first they denounced (the) that bill about making corporations do something, to match the obligation of human lives. Yes, at first they denounced the bill, but then, when public opinion rose up to demand it, they seized their trapeze with the greatest of ease, and reversed themselves in mid-air. (Applause and laughter)

This record of Republican leadership -- a record of timidity, of weakness (and), of short-sightedness -- is as bad in international as in military affairs.

It is the same record of timidity, of weakness (and), of short-sightedness which they showed in domestic affairs when they were in control before 1933. (Applause)

But the Republican leaders' memories seem to have been short, in this, as in some other matters. And by the way -- who was it said that an elephant never forgets? (Laughter and applause)

Yes, it is the same record of timidity, of weakness and of short-sightedness (which) that governed the policy of the confused, reactionary governments in France and England before the war.

That fact was discovered too late in France.

It was discovered just in time in (Great Britain) England. (Applause)

(Please) Pray God, (may that spirit never prevail in our land) that, having discovered it, we won't forget it either. (Applause)

For eight years our main concern, as you know and as the nation knows, has been to look for peace and the preservation of peace. (Applause)

Back in 1935, in the face of growing dangers throughout the world, your Government undertook to eliminate (the) certain hazards which in the past had led us (to) into war.

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps:

We made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right? (Yes -- applause)



We made it clear that American investors, who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations, could not call on American warships or American soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right? (Yes -- applause)

We made it clear that we would not use American armed forces to intervene in affairs of the sovereign republics to the south of us. Was that right? (Yes -- applause)

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent; and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right? (Applause)

In all these ways we made it clear to every American, and to every foreign nation that we would avoid becoming entangled through some episode beyond our borders.

(These) Those were measures to keep us at peace. And through all the years (of war) since 1935, there has been no entanglement and there will be no entanglement. (Applause)

And we have had plenty of chances to get into trouble. I know that well.

In (July,) 1937, in July, Japan invaded China.

On January 3, 1938, I called the attention of the nation to the danger of the whole world situation.

It was clear that rearmament was now, unfortunately, a necessary implement of peace. And I asked for large additions to American defenses. Yes, I was called an alarmist -- and worse names than that. (Laughter) I have learned by now to take it on the chin. (Applause)

In March, 1938, German troops marched into Vienna.

In September, 1938, came the Munich crisis. (Boos) German,



French and Czech armies were mobilized. The result was only an abortive armistice.

I said then: "It is becoming increasingly clear that peace by fear has no higher (nor) or more enduring quality than peace by the sword."

Three months later, at Lima, Peru, the twenty-one American Republics, including our own, solemnly agreed to stand together to defend the independence of each one of us. (Applause)

(The) That declaration at Lima was a great step toward peace. For unless the Hemisphere is safe, we are not safe.

Matters, matters in Europe grew steadily worse (in Europe). Czecho-Slovakia was overrun by the Nazis. (Roos) General war seemed inevitable.

Yet even then, in the summer of 1939, the Republican leaders kept chanting, "There will be no war."

A few months later -- on the first of September, 1939 -- war came.

The steps, the steps which we had carefully planned were put into effect.

American ships were kept from danger zones.

American citizens were helped to come home.

And, unlike 1914, there was no financial upheaval. (Applause)

Very soon, in a few weeks, the American Republics set up at Panama a system of patrolling the waters of the whole Western Hemisphere, with success.

I (ask you) am asking the American people to support a continuance of this type of affirmative, realistic fight for peace. (Applause)

The alternative is to risk the future of the country in the hands of those with this record of timidity, weakness and short-sightedness or to risk it in the hands, (in) the inexperienced hands, of those who in these perilous days are willing recklessly to imply that our boys are already on their way to the transports. (Boos)

But, on our side, this affirmative search for peace calls for clear vision. It is necessary to mobilize resources, to mobilize minds and skills, and every active force for peace in all the world.

We have steadily sought to keep mobilized the greatest force of all -- religious faith, devotion to God. (Applause)

Your Government is working at all times with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths. (Applause) Without these (spiritual forces we cannot make or maintain peace, and all three of them work with us toward that great end) three, all three of them, without them working with us toward that great end, things would not be clear or as easy.

Shadows, shadows (however) are still heavy over the faith and the hope of mankind.

We -- who walk in the ways of peace and freedom and light -- we have seen the tragedies enacted in one free land after another.

We have not been blind to the causes, or (to) the consequences of these tragedies.

We guard ourselves against all evils -- spiritual as well as material -- which may beset us. We guard against the forces of anti-Christian aggression, which may attack us from without, and the forces of ignorance and fear which may corrupt us from within.

We (shall continue to) go forward (in) with firm faith. And we shall continue to go forward in peace.